

4.  
(4)  
AN  
EXPOSITION  
OF THE  
DOCTRINE  
OF THE

Church of England,

IN THE  
Several ARTICLES propos'd by  
Monsieur de M E A U X,

Late Bishop of Condom,

IN HIS  
EXPOSITION of the DOCTRINE  
OF THE

Catholick Church.

To which is prefix'd a particular account of  
*Monsieur de Meaux's Book.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose and Crown* in *St. Paul's*  
Church-yard. MDCLXXXVI.

EXPOSITION

DOCTRINE

Church of England

1851

1851

Exposition of the Doctrine

Catholic Church

1851

1851



i

---

# THE P R E F A C E.

**T**HE Smalness of this Treatise would hardly justifie the solemnity of a Preface, but that it might be thought too great a rudeness to press without some Ceremony upon a Book, which both the Merit and Character of the Author, and the Quality of those Approbations he has prefix'd to it, may justly seem to have fenced from all vulgar attempts, as Sacred and inviolable. It may perhaps be some satisfaction to the Reader too to know, how it is come to pass that a Meer Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, pretending to contain nothing but what they have always professed, and in their Council of Trent plainly declared to be their Doctrine; should have become so considerable, as not only to be approved by many Persons of the greatest Eminency in that Church, but even to be recommended by the whole body of the Clergy of France in their Assembly 1682; Method, 10. and wherever it has come, done so many Miracles, as not only common report speaks, but even the Advertisment it self prefixed to it, takes care to tell us that it has.

## The Preface.

*The first design of Monsieur de Meaux's Book was either to satisfy or to seduce the late Marechal de Turenne. How far it contributed thereunto I am not able to say; but am willing to believe that the change that honourable Person made of his Religion, was upon some better grounds than the bare Exposition of a few Articles of the Roman Faith; and that the Author supplied either in his personal Conferences with him, or by some other Papers to us unknown, what was wanting to the first draught which we have seen of this.*

*The Manuscript Copy which then appeared, and for about four Tears together passed up and down in private hands with great applause, wanted all those Chapters of the Eucharist, Tradition, The Authority of the Church and Pope, which now make up the most considerable part of it; and in the other points which it handled, seemed so loosely and favourably to propose the Opinions of the Church of Rome, that not only many undesigning Persons of that Communion were offended at it, but the Protestants who saw it, generally believed that Monsieur de Meaux durst not publicly own, what in his Exposition he privately pretended to be their Doctrine.*

*And the Event shew'd that they were not altogether mistaken. For in the beginning of the Year 1671 the Exposition being with great care, and after the consideration of many years reduced into the form in which we now see it; and to secure all, fortified with the Approbation of the Archbishop of Reims and nine other Bishops, who profess that 'Having examined it with 'all the Care which the importance of the matter 'required, they found it conformable to the Doctrine of the Church, and as such recommended it 'to*

## The Preface.

iii

to the People which God had committed to their conduct, it was sent to the Press. The impression being finish'd and just ready to come abroad; the Author, who desired to appear with all the Advantage to himself and his Cause that was possible, sent it to some of the Doctors of the Sorbonne for their Approbation to be joyn'd to that of the Bishops, that so no Authority, ordinary or extraordinary might be wanting to assert the Doctrine contained in it, to be so far from the suspicion the Protestants had conceived of it, that it was truly and without disguise Catholick, Apostolick, and Roman.

But to the great surprise of Monsieur de Meaux, and those who had so much cry'd up his Treatise before, the Doctors of the Sorbonne to whom it was communicated, instead of the Approbation that was expected, confirmed what the Protestants had said of it; and, as became their faculty, marked several of the most considerable parts of it, wherein the Exposition by the too great desire of palliating, had absolutely perverted the Doctrine of their Church.

To prevent the open Scandal which such a Censure might have caus'd, with great Industry, and all the Secrecy possible, the whole Edition was suppress'd, and the several places which the Doctors had marked changed; and the Copy so speedily sent back to the Press again, that in the end of the same year another much altered was publicly expos'd, as the first Impression that had at all been made of it.

Yet this could not be so privately carry'd, but that it soon came to a publick knowledge; insomuch that one of the first Answers that was made to it, charg'd Monsieur de Meaux with this change. I do not hear that he has ever yet thought fit to deny the Relation, either

ther in the Advertisement prefixed to the later Editions of his Book, wherein yet he replies to some other passages of the same Treatise, or in any other Vindication; Whether it be that such an imputation was not considerable enough to be taken notice of, or that it was too true to be deny'd, let the Reader judge. But certainly it appears to us not only to give a clear account of the Design and Genius of the whole Book; but to be a plain demonstration, how improbable soever Monsieur de Meaux would represent it, 'That it is not impossible for a Bishop of the Church of Rome, either not to be sufficiently instructed in his Religion to know what is the Doctrine of it; or not sufficiently sincere, as without disguise to represent it. And since a Copy of that very Book so marked, as has been said, by the Doctors of the Sorbonne is fallen into my hands, I shall gratifie the \* Readers curiosity with a particular View of some of the Changes that have been made, that so he may judge whether of the Two were the Cause of those great advances, which the Author in that first Edition had thought fit to make towards us.

Advertisement  
Pag. 1.

\* See the Collection at the end of the Preface.

It might perhaps appear a very pardonable curiosity in us, after the knowledge we have had of the first miscarriage of this Book at the Sorbonne, to enquire how it comes to pass, that among so many other Approbations as have with great Industry been procured to the later Editions of it, we do not yet see any subscription of theirs to it, even now. Monsieur de Meaux could not certainly be ignorant of what weight the Censure of that Learned Faculty is with us; and that such an Approbation might not only have been more easily obtained, but would also more effectually have wiped away the blot cast upon this Book by their former refusal, than all the Letters and

## The Preface.

IV

and Complements that could come from the other side the Mountains, and which France it self hath taught us, in maters more considerable than this, not to have too high a Value for: Nor can we suppose any thing else, than that the fear of a further Correction kept it from being any more submitted to their Censure; and that the Author would rather pass without the Honour of their Approbation, than run the hazard of a second Refusal.

But for this, because we cannot speak any thing certain, we will not pursue our Conjectures. Certain it is that whatever the judgment of the Sorbonne would now have been of it, many of the Church of Rome were still dissatisfied with it. \* And how improbable soever Monsieur de Meaux would have us think that one of his Answerers affirms, that a Papist should have written against him; Yet not only the confessed sincerity of Monsieur Conrart who often declared that he had seen it, but the undoubted integrity of some others by whom I have been assured that they had it, in their hands, obliges me to joyn in the assertion, that Monsieur M—, one of the Roman Communion had finish'd an Answer to it, before any of the Protestants were publish'd, however upon some certain Considerations it was thought fit to suppress it.

\* See his Advertisement.

It will perhaps be looked upon, that this confirmation of that Manuscript Answer deserves as little assent, as Monsieur de Meaux has thought fit to give to Monsieur de la B—'s first Assertion of it. And therefore to shew that it is not impossible, nor indeed very improbable, that Papists should write one against another; and that the Method of the Exposition, how plausible soever to deceive Protestants, has nevertheless defended the sincere and Undesigning of the other Commu-

B

nion;



nion; I will beg leave to produce two or three undeniable Witnesses upon some of the first and chiefest Points of it; and which though not written purposely against it, yet I am perswaded, Monsieur de Meaux himself will be so just as to confess, that he cannot be altogether unconcerned in them.

For his first Point, The Invocation of Saints; The great moderation of the Exposition tells us only, 'That it is useful to pray to them, and that we ought to do it in the same Spirit of Charity, and in the same Order of Brotherly Society with which we intreat our Friends on Earth to pray for us: that all the Prayers of the Church howsoever they may be worded, yet must still be understood to be reduced to this form, PRAY FOR US.

Now what Monsieur de Meaux here says in general concerning the Invocation of Saints, another Tract Printed about the same time at Cologne, and intituled Salutary Advertisements of the Blessed Virgin, to her indiscreet Adorers; particularly applied to that Service, which with so much superstition is paid in the Church of Rome to the Mother of Christ.

[ *Avis salutaires de la bienheureuse Vierge à ses Devots indiscrets.*

This Tract

was publish'd first at Gand in Latin, by Monsieur Widenfelt a German, Intendant of the Affairs of the Prince of Suarzenbergh; afterwards Translated into French.]

The Book is every where full of Expressions of Honour and Respect for her; and only speaks against that Worship which Monsieur de Meaux here declares in the name of the Council of Trent to be none of theirs. It was sent abroad into the World with all the Advantage imaginable: It had the Approbation of the Bishop of Mysia, Suffragan to the Archbishop of Cologne; of the Vicar General of the

## The Preface.

vii

*the place ; of the Censure of Gant ; of the Canons and Divines of Malines ; of the University of Louvain ; and Lastly of Monsieur the Bishop of Tournay, who recommended it as a Treatise full of solid Piety, and very fit and necessary to draw people out of those Errours and Abuses into which their Superstition had led them.*

*Yet notwithstanding all this Applause, if we enquire what Success this Book had with others, Father Craffet the Jesuit, who wrote purposely against it, \* his Book Printed at Paris 1679, Licensed by the Provincial, approved by the three Fathers of the Society appointed to examine it, and Lastly, authorized by the King's Permission, tells us, † That for fear of giving Scandal to Hereticks, he had given a very great one to (those he calls) Catholicks : That the Learned Men of all Nations had written against him ; that the Holy See had condemn'd him ; Spain had banish'd him out of its Dominions, and forbid to Read or Print his Book, as containing Propositions suspected of Errour and Impiety ; that abused the Holy Scripture, and imposed upon Catholicks, by taking them off from the Piety and Devotion due to the Mother of God ; In a word, from the general Invocation of Saints and Worship of Images.*

\* See his Book entitled *La véritable devotion envers La St. Vierge. 4<sup>e</sup>.*  
† *La Preface* p. 1, 2.

*I shall not need to say how far the Fathers Zeal carries him in the Answer it self : It is evident that what Monsieur de Meaux tells us, is only Useful, the Jesuit declares to be absolutely Necessary : That we are indispensably obliged to pray to her : That it is the intention of God, that we should obtain both Grace and Glory by her ; That all Men should be saved by the Merits*

Page. 31. &c.

‘ of the Son, and the Intercession of the Mother, and that forasmuch therefore as God has resolved not to give any Grace but what passes through the Hands of *Mary*; as we cannot be saved without Grace, so it must be confessed that we cannot be saved without her. *This is I presume somewhat more than what Monsieur de Meaux expounds to us; and I shall leave it to any one to judge whether this Father who has shew’d himself so zealous against the Author of the Blessed Virgins Salutary Advertisements, could have been very well pleased with Monsieur de Meaux’s Exposition.*

See the Collection at the end of the Preface.

*The next Point which the Exposition advances, is concerning The Worship of Images, Monsieur de Meaux in the Edition suppressed, affirmed, ‘ That the Church of Rome does not so much honour the Image of the Apostle or Martyr, as the Apostle or Martyr in presence of the Image. And though the Censure passed upon this new fancy, obliged him to speak a little more plainly, yet is it only thus, even now, ‘ that when the Church pays an Honour to the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, her intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in presence of the Image.*

*Concerning which the Reader may please to observe, that Cardinal Capisucchi one of the Approvers of Monsieur de Meaux’s Exposition, has lately set forth a Volume of Controversies at Rome, with all the most solemn Permissions and Approbations that can be desired, in which he formally contradicts the Doctrine of the same Exposition in this Point; and Art. 8. p. 647. concludes, ‘ That the Church in the Councils of Nice and Trent forbids only such a Divine Honour to Images as is Idolatrous, i. e. says he, ‘ which*

which is paid to Images in and for themselves ;  
and by which the Image is worshipped, as if some  
God or Divinity were contained in it. But for that  
Divine Worship which is paid to the Images of the  
Holy Trinity, of our Saviour Christ and the Holy  
Cross, upon the account of the things represented  
by them, and as they are in that respect one and  
the same with the thing which they represent, and  
ascribes not any Divinity to the Images, there ne-  
ver was, nor can be any dispute of it.

Monfieur de Meaux may please to consider whether  
this be not sufficiently contrary to the Doctrine Expound-  
ed by Him; and how we are to reconcile the Contro-  
versies of the Cardinal Capisucchi, with the Letter  
and Approbation of the \* Master of the Sacred Palace.  
In the mean time I will beg leave to add one instance  
more, that is nigher home, and I think still at this time  
depending; and which the particular interest Monsieur  
de Meaux has more ways than one had in it, will I sup-  
pose undoubtedly satisfy him, that notwithstanding the  
Assembly of the Clergy have recommended so much  
both his Book and his Method, all nevertheless at this  
day are not very well satisfied, even in France it self,  
either with the one or other.

\* So he was  
when he  
wrote to Mon-  
fieur de Meaux.

† Monsieur † Imbert Priest and Doctor of Divinity in  
the Province of Bourdeaux was not long since accus'd,  
that upon Good Friday before he proceeded to the  
solemn service of that day, which consists chiefly in the  
Adoration of the Cross; He turned to the People, and  
taking occasion from the rashness of some of the Fa-  
thers of the Mission whom he had with grief heard  
maintain, That the Cross was to be adored after  
the very same manner as Jesus Christ in the Sa-  
crament of the Eucharist; profess'd to them that

† The whole  
of this is taken  
out of the  
Faction which  
he printed of  
his Case.

he



## The Preface.

'he could not enter on the service of that day with-  
 'out declaring truly to them what the real Doctrine  
 'of the Church as to this point was. That the  
 'Church designed not that we should adore the Cross  
 'which we see, but that we should adore Jesus Christ  
 'whom we do not see. That there was a great  
 'difference between the Cross and the Holy Sacra-  
 'ment; That in this our Saviour Christ was really pre-  
 'sent, whereas that was only a simple figure or represen-  
 'tation of him.

'This was his Accusation, and he confessed that his  
 'Opinion was, That the Church adored not the Cross,  
 'and that the contrary Opinion was not only  
 'false but Idolatrous. That not only the Prote-  
 'stants made their advantage of those who main-  
 'tain'd such Errors, but that he himself was scan-  
 'dalized to converse every day with the Missionaries  
 'and others, whom he had openly heard preach a hun-  
 'dred times, That we ought to adore the Cross  
 'with Jesus Christ, as the Humane nature of our  
 'Saviour with the Divine.

'Being accused for this, he defended himself with  
 'all the strength of Argument that he was able; yet  
 'being still accounted a Heretick for it, he finally alleg-  
 'ed in his defence, That the Exposition of Monsieur  
 'de Meaux defended the very same; that he went  
 'upon his principles, whose book was approved by  
 'the Pope and several Cardinals in Italy, by the  
 'Bishops and Clergy of France and others of the  
 'greatest note in the Church of Rome.

'Nevertheless he was suspended in a manner grie-  
 'vous and extraordinary: He wrote to Monsieur de  
 'Meaux himself about it, who presently sent to the Arch-  
 'bishop of Bourdeaux in his behalf: He addressed him-  
 'self



*'self besides to many other the most considerable Persons of the Kingdom; to Monsieur the Chancellour; Monsieur de Chatteau-neuf; to the Intendant of the Province, only that he might have justice in a cause, which according to Monsieur de Meaux's principles, was certainly very favourable; But I do not hear that he has yet had any other Effect of all his supplications, and the interest of those Honourable persons in his behalf, than that they still draw more and severer menaces from his Judges, and threats either of perpetual Imprisonment, or even death it self for his Offence.*

*After this clear conviction I may reasonably hope it will appear no improbable matter to Monsieur de Meaux himself, either that one Papist should have written against his Book, or that many others should have expressed themselves to be of a mind very different from the principles and opinions of it. Had it pleased him to have gratified the World with the sight of Cardinal Buillon's and Monsieur l'Abbé de Dangeau's letters to Cardinal Bona and Cardinal Chigi, as well as of their answers to them, they would perhaps have shewn, that not only the Protestants pretended such oppositions of his own party to his Book, but that Monsieur de Meaux himself was not altogether unsensible of it.*

*No sooner was the first Impression of the Exposition which was permitted to pass abroad, finish'd, but presently a Copy was dispatch'd to Rome, with Letters and recommendations to prepare the way for its reception in that Court; and provide against those faults which some it seems accused it of, if the Contradictors*

See the Advertisement.

[ Cardinal Bona's Letter: V. E. mi accenna che alcuni

la Accusano da qual che mancamento. And a little after, Ne mi maraviglio che gli habbino trovato à dire, perchè tutte le Opere grande, e che Sormontano l'Ordinario sempre hanno Contradictori — Answer to Cardinal Buillon. ]

opposed

*opposed it at home, should think fit to pursue it thither.*

See the Answer of Cardinal Chigi to Monsieur L'Abbé de Dangeau; [Parlato al Padre Maestro

di S. Palazzo, & al Secretario della congregazione dell'Indice, e comobbi Veramente che non vi era stato chi havesse a questi padri parlato in disfavore del medesimo.]

*It is not to be supposed that either the dignity of the Cardinal who sent the Book, or of him to whom it was address'd, would have permitted them in such a manner to take notice of the faults and the Contradictors which their Letters speak of, had they not been both things, and Persons worthy their consideration. But much less would Monsieur l'Abbé de Dangeau have used his interest with Cardinal Chigi to gain the favour of the Master of the Sacred Palace, and of the Congregation del Indice, if any one had or should speak against it, had there been no cause to apprehend that any one would attempt either.*

See Advertisement, &c.

*What other particular persons were employ'd upon the like Offices, is a secret too close for us to be able to penetrate. Only the Advertisement it self gives us cause to believe that great interest was made even by the French Ambassador himself to his Holiness about it; and that the few Letters we see set out with so much Industry both in the Originals and their Translation, and the long History of them in the Advertisement, were the effects of a labour and interest, great as the long term of eight years that were spent in the procuring of them.*

*The second Answer to Monsieur de Meaux has so fully examined every one of these Approbations, and so plainly shew'd how small account is to be made of them, that we do not find that in four years that it has been publish'd, any one has undertaken to reply to it. I will therefore only add in general a remark or two that may serve to inform those of our own Country who are unacquainted with such intrigues, what the*

## The Preface.

xiii

the Method of the Approbations of the Church of Rome is, and how little stress is to be laid upon them.

*It is a long time since it has been resolved by many of their Casuists, that it is lawful to disguise the sentiments of their Religion, not only in private Conferences, but in the very Pulpit it self, when there is a sufficient reason for the doing of it. But I cannot tell whether it be yet so generally known that it is lawful for them to set their hands to and approve those Books whose Principles and Doctrine they dislike, by an Art peculiar to themselves, and which Protestants, who are used to sincere dealing, will find it a little difficult to believe.*

*The instance of Cardinal Capisucchi before mentioned is an undeniable proof of this for Italy; Who about the same time that he sent his Letter and Approbation to Monsieur deMeaux of his Exposition, wrote, as we have seen, directly contrary to the Doctrine of it, and had his Book approved with no less solemnity at Rome, than Monsieur deMeaux can pretend his to have been. And for France, a Person very justly esteemed both for his great Quality and his own worth, Monsieur the Procureur General of the Parliament of Paris, having clearly revealed the mystery of it, I shall beg leave to represent it to the World, under the advantage of so great and unquestionable an Authority.*

*Father Thomassin about twenty years since printed a Book which he called Notæ in Concilia; the design whereof was to set up the Authority of the Pope above all Councils, which he renders in a manner useless to the decision of Ecclesiastical matters. The Copies of this Book were all seized, and lock'd up in a Chamber of the Fathers Oratorians at Paris.*

C

Ten

## The Preface.

*Ten or twelve years after, with some changes to fill up the Leaves that had been censured, and the Approbation of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, he again attempted to have it publish'd. But Monsieur the Procureur General opposed it, and told him that but in consideration of Father Harlay, his near Relation, who interposed for him, he would have had his Book burnt by the hand of the common Hangman.*

*The Father justified himself that his Book contained no other Principles than what were found in Cardinal Bellarmine's Controversies, which had been printed with authority, and were permitted to be every day publicly sold in France. The Procureur General replied, ' That they suffered in France, that ' an Italian should write according to the Principles ' of his Country, and that this ought not to hinder ' but that a Book, otherwise good, might be publickly printed and sold with privilege; but that ' for a Frenchman to do the same, was another matter, and would have different consequences: ' and that in short, The Italians used the same method ' towards them.*

*And indeed the late change of the Jesuits in their Approbations plainly shews, that it is permitted to those of the Church of Rome to write and approve not so much according to their own Opinions, as to the Principles and Genius of the Country in which they live. For which reason the Fathers of the Society do no longer now, as formerly they were wont, take out their Licence from the General of their Order, but from their respective Provincials; who accommodate themselves to the current Doctrine of the place in which the Book is publish'd; without which it would be almost impossible for them to write in France, but they should be subject to the danger of a censure at Rome.* After

# The Preface.

·XV

After this general account of the Nature of the Approbations of the Church of Rome, I shall spare both my self and Reader the trouble of examining the several Letters before the Exposition, though otherwise they lie open to many exceptions; only concerning his Holiness's Brief, which Monsieur de Meaux so much triumphs in, it may not be amiss to observe, that the last Pope, in whose time the Exposition came first to Rome with great Recommendation, yet never gave any Approbation to it; and that the present Pope did it 'upon occasion of a sub-

missive Letter of the Authors to him, and after the reports that he had heard of the great \* Con-versions that were every where made by it, to which such an Approbation would be likely to add a new force. So plain is the intrigue and design of this, that were the Popes Briefs otherwise of as great consideration, as the Papists themselves shew them to be of little value, yet this could not be regarded by us, as any other than a meer Artifice to deceive us, not a sincere, much less authoritative Approbation either of the Nature or Principles of Monsieur de Meaux's Book.

† L' Au-  
teur—fit  
avec un tres  
profond respect  
ses tres  
humbles remer-  
cimens au Pape  
par une Lettre  
du 22. Nov.  
1678. dont il  
recut reponse  
par un Bref  
de sa Sainteté  
du 4 Jan.  
79. Avertiss.  
And in the  
Brief it  
self, Devoti-  
onem interim

atque Observantiam quam erga sanctam hanc sedem nosque ipsos qui in ea Catholica Ecclesia immerito presidemus tue ad Nos Litere luculenter declarant, maxime charitatis affectu complessimur. \* The Bishop of Strasburgh having accounted to his Holiness his design of Translating the Exposition into the German Language, Sa Sainteté lui fit dire qu'il connoissoit ce livre, & qu'on luy raportoit de tous costez qu'il faisoit beaucoup de Con-versions. Avertissement.

But whatever the Opinion either of the Pope or Papists has been of this Exposition, certain it is the Protestants have openly enough declared their thoughts concerning it; and the Exposition according



Card. Bna's  
Letter.

*to the fate of all other great and extraordinary things, has found enough on this side to oppose it.*

*It was but a very little time after the first Edition of it, that Monsieur Noguier and another Author well known, yet whose name I spare, because he has not thought fit himself to discover it, wrote against it; and with so much success, that the Papists themselves confess, 'That it was an ill Cause defended extremely well.*

*Monsieur de Turenne not long before that last Campagne in which he lost his Life, made great boasts of a Reply that was speedily to be publish'd to them; but after the long expectation of above eight Years, only an Advertilement was prefix'd to a new Edition of the Book, which neither touches at all the greatest part of the Exceptions that had been made against it, nor gives any satisfaction to those it do's take notice of.*

*It has been the constant method of Monsieur de Meaux, having once written, to leave his Tracts to the World, and take no care to defend them against those assaults, that seem with success enough to have been sometimes made upon them. We should think the great Employments, in which he has had the Honour to be engaged, might have been the cause of this, did not he who takes no care to defend his old Books, find still time enough to write new. Perhaps he looks upon his pieces to be of a Spirit and Force sufficient to despise whatever attempts can be made upon them; but sure he cannot be ignorant, that Protestants make another and far different Conclusion, and look upon those Opinions to be certainly indefensible, which so able and eminent an Author is content so openly, and, if I may be permitted to add it, so shamefully to forsake.*

*What*

*What other Answers besides those I have now mentioned have been made to it, I cannot undertake to say; Two others only that I know of have been publish'd; the Author of the latter of which Monsieur de Brueys having in a very little time after his writing left his Religion, might have made a new instance of Monsieur de Meaux's Conquests, did not his inability to answer his own arguments against the Exposition, give us cause to believe, that some other Motives than those of that Book induced him so lightly to forsake a Cause, which he had so soundly and generously defended.*

*And now after so many Answers yet unreplyed to, if any one desires to know what the design of the present undertaking is, they may please to understand, that having by a long Converse among the Papists of our own and other Countries perceived that either by the ignorance or malice of their Instructors, they have generally very false and imperfect Notions of our Opinions in the matters in Controversie between us, I have suffered my self to be persuaded to pursue the Method of Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition as to the Doctrine of the Church of England; and oppose sincerely to what he pretends is the Opinion of the Roman Church, that form of Faith that is openly profess'd and taught without any disguise or dissimulation among us.*

*I was not unwilling to take the Method of Monsieur de Meaux for my direction, as well upon the account of the great Reputation both of the Book and of the Author, as because it is now some years that it has pass'd in our Language without any answer that I know of made to it. Besides, that the late new Impression made*

*of*

of it, with all the advantages of the Advertisement and Approbations, which the later French Editions have added to it, seemed naturally to require some such Consideration.

I do not pretend by any thing of this to treat Monsieur de Meaux as an Enemy, but rather as both his great Learning, and that Character which I have ever learnt very highly to reverence, oblige me, to follow him as my Guide. To render an account to him and to the World what our differences are, and point out in passing some of those reasons that are the most usually given amongst us, wherefore we cannot totally assent to what he proposes.

I am persuaded the whole is done with that Charity and Moderation, that there is nothing in it that can justly offend the most zealous Enemy of our Church. If I knew of any thing in it that without dissembling the Truth might have been omitted, I sincerely profess I would most willingly have done it, being desirous to please all, that so, if it be the will of God, I may by any means gain some.

For this cause chiefly have I forbore to set my name to it, lest perhaps any prejudice against my Person, might chance to injure the Excellence of the Cause which I maintain.

This effect at least, if no other, I would willingly hope such a Treatise may have upon those of our Country that have been taught to believe very differently concerning us; That they would please no longer to form such horrible Ideas of our Profession as they have heretofore been wont to do; at least till it can be shewn that I have either palliated or prevaricated the Doctrine

## The Preface.

xix

Doctrine of the Church of England in this Exposition. Which I am yet so assured I have not done, that I here intirely submit both my self and it to her Censure ; of whose Communion I esteem it my greatest Happiness that I am, and for whose preservation and Enlargement I shall never cease, as I ought, to pray.

---

A Col-

---

The Preface.

THE PREFACE OF THE EDITOR OF THE  
SECOND EDITION OF THE HISTORY OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BY  
JAMES M. SMITH, ESQ., OF NEW-YORK.  
IN TWO VOLUMES. VOL. I.  
NEW-YORK: PUBLISHED BY  
J. B. LIPPINCOTT, 151 NASSAU ST.  
1854.

A. C. S.



*A Collection of some of those Passages*  
that were corrected in the first Edition of the  
EXPOSITION suppressed by Monsieur  
de Meaux : To which is added, the Censure of  
the Faculty of Louvain, upon some part of the  
Doctrine still remaining in it.

§. I.

**M**onsieur de Meaux in the very beginning of  
his Book speaking of the design of it, had  
these Words :

*1. Edit.*

“ So that it seems then to be very proper to pro-  
“ pose to them ( the Protestants ) the Doctrine  
“ of the Catholick Church, separating those  
“ Questions which the Church has decided, from  
“ those which do not belong to Faith. p. 1.

It is evident, the meaning of Monsieur de Meaux  
in that passage must have been this ; That what-  
soever was either not at all contained in his Expo-  
sition, or was otherwise maintain'd by any particu-  
lar Authors, beyond the Exposition he gives us of  
those Points which are here mentioned, was not to  
be look'd upon by us, as any of the Church's Decision,  
nor necessary to be received by us as matter of Faith.

I shall not need to say how many Doctrines and  
Decisions, not only of private Writers, but of the ve-  
ry Council of Trent it self, this would have at once  
cut off. It would perhaps have been one of the fair-  
est

D

est

est Advances towards an Union, that ever the Church of Rome yet offered. But it seems whatever *Monsieur de Meaux* supposed, this was thought too great a condescension by others : and he was therefore obliged, without changing any thing in his Book, to give us a quite other account of the design of it.

*Later Editions.*

“ So that it seems then we can do nothing better, than simply to propose to them (the Protestants) the sentiments of the Catholick Church, and *distinguish them from those Opinions that have been falsely imputed to her.* Which is but little to the Purpose.

I I.

1. Edit. p. 7, 8. “ The same Church teaches, “ That all Religious Worship ought to terminate upon God, as its necessary End. So that “ *the Honour* which the Church gives to the “ Blessed Virgin and to the Saints *is religious,* “ only because it gives them that Honour with “ relation to God, and for the love of him.

“ So that then, so far ought one to be from “ blaming the Honour which we give to the “ Saints, as our Adversaries do, because it is “ *Religious,* that on the contrary it *ought to be* “ *blamed if it were not Religious.*

There can be nothing more plain than that *Monsieur de Meaux's* Opinion, when he wrote this, was, “ *That the Honour which the Church of Rome pays to the Blessed Virgin and Saints departed is a Religi-*

ous Honour; nay would deserve to be blamed if it were not Religious.

This was by others thought a little too ingenuous, and what would give too great an advantage to our objections against it. And therefore instead of that free, honest Confession, *That the Church of Rome gives religious Honour to the Blessed Virgin and Saints departed*, he now puts a doubt that insinuates the direct contrary,

“The same Church teaches us, that all religious Worship ought to terminate in God as its necessary End; and if the Honour which she rendereth to the Blessed Virgin and to the Saints, may in some sense be called Religious, it is for its necessary relation to God.

So that really then the Honour they give their Saints in Monsieur de Meaux's opinion is Religious, but 'tis not fit that we should know it.

### III.

Monsieur Daillé some years since wrote a Volume of the Tradition of the Primitive Church, concerning the Object of Religious Worship; in which he clearly shews that the first 300 years knew nothing of the Invocation of Saints, the Worship of Images, Crosses, and Reliques; of the Adoration of the Host, &c. Monsieur de Meaux in his first Exposition granted the whole, in these words since struck out,

“For Monsieur Daillé, says he, he thinks fit to confine himself to the first three Centuries, in

" which it is certain that the Church more exercised in suffering than in writing, has left  
 " many things to be cleared afterwards both in its  
 " Doctrine and in its Practice. 1 Edit. p. 9.

Now it being evident, notwithstanding this new thought, that *the sufferings* of the first 300 years have not hindred, but that we have very large accounts of its Doctrine and Practice from *the Writings* of those Fathers who lived in them; To confess that *it is certain*, that the Tradition of the Church of Rome fails in many things both in Doctrine and Practice for the first 300 years, is doubtless as fair a yielding up the Cause, as to the matter of Tradition, as we could desire; and therefore however known by *Monsieur de Meaux* to be *most certainly true*, was yet thought too much by others to be confessed to the World, by a person of so great Learning and Eminence in their Church.

## IV.

As to the point of *the Invocation of Saints*, *Monsieur de Meaux* still shews us that he knows not what account to give of the grounds of it. He proposes several ways how the Saints may possibly know our Prayers, but cannot well tell us by which it is they do so.

But in the first Edition he shew'd yet more doubt: Not only *which way the Saints hear them*, but *whether they hear them at all or no*: Not only, *whether they join with them in their Prayers, as they desire them to do*, but whether it is not rather by some other means, yet more unknown to them, and not by their Intercession, that they receive the benefit of them.

" The Church, says he, contents her self to  
 " teach with all Antiquity, these prayers to be

“ be very profitable to such who make them ;  
 “ *Whether it be* the Saints know them by the  
 “ Ministry and Communication of Angels, who  
 “ according to the Testimony of Scripture know  
 “ what passes amongst us ; being established by  
 “ Gods order as administering spirits to co-operate  
 “ with us in the work of our salvation : *Whether it be* that God makes known to them our  
 “ desires by a particular revelation : Or *whether it be* that he discovers the secret to them in  
 “ his Divine Essence in which all truth is compriz’d.

“ And that in *the manner*, and according to the  
 “ measure which he pleases ; or *whether* lastly  
 “ by *some other way yet more impenetrable and*  
 “ more unknown he causes us to receive the Fruit  
 “ of those Prayers which we address to those blessed  
 “ Souls. 1 Ed. p. 23.

So that in effect, *whether the Saints hear us or no, whether they joyn with us in our requests or no*, according to Monsieur de Meaux’s Exposition, their Church knows not ; which is sure a sufficient prejudice against their Invocation ; and was, it seems, thought so by those who therefore caus’d all the latter part of this paragraph to be struck out, for fear of the advantage we might reasonably make of it.

V.

But if Monsieur de Meaux in his first Exposition freely confess’d how uncertain the grounds of this Invocation were, he no less freely left it to our choice whether we would practise it or not. He assured us there was no manner of obligation at all upon us so to do :



*do: And that the Church would not condemn us if we did it nor, provided we refused it not out of contempt, or with a Spirit of dissension and Revolt.*

*"Furthermore, says he, there is nothing so unjust as to accuse the Church of placing all her piety in these devotions to the Saints; since on the contrary she lays no obligation at all on particular persons to joyn in this Practice.*

*"By which it appears clearly that the Church condemns only those who refuse it out of contempt, and by a Spirit of dissension and revolt.*  
*"Ed. p. 33, 34.*

This was *Monsieur de Meaux's* first *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church* in this point: But such as his *Correctors* it seems would not admit of: Who therefore obliged him wholly to strike out that passage,

*"That the Church imposes no obligation at all upon particular persons to practise this Invocation:*

And instead of condemning only those that refuse it out of *contempt*, or a *Spirit of dissension and revolt*, which had freed us wholly from their *Anathema*, to expound it now more severely.

*"That she condemns those who refuse this practice whether out of disrespect or Error.*  
*Which will be sure to bring us under it.*

VI.

In the article of Images Monsieur de Meaux having first laid down this foundation;

“That the Church of Rome does not attribute  
“to them *any other virtue* than that of exciting  
“in us the remembrance of those whom they  
“represent;

added in his first Exposition which was suppressed,

“’Tis in this consists *the use and advantage* of  
“Images. 1 Edit. p. 25.

And to assure us yet further how little Honour they had for them, concluded thus,

“So that to speak properly, and according to  
“the Ecclesiastical style, we do not so much  
“honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr,  
“as we do honour the Apostle or Martyr in pre-  
“sence of the Image. 1 Edit. p. 26.

Now though we do not doubt but that this is the real opinion of Monsieur de Meaux, and all which he himself does, yet to say that the Church of Rome does neither require, nor practise, nor intend any more, was to presume too much upon our Ignorance; and indeed to give too great a scandal to many of her own Communion, more zealous than himself for this service: And therefore we find it now expounded in a manner more conformable to the truth, though still exceedingly mollified,

“’Tis.

"Tis upon this is founded the Honour which  
"we give to Images : and again.

"When we honour the Image of an Apo-  
"stle or Martyr, our Intention is not so much  
"to honour the Image, as the Apostle or  
"Martyr in presence of the Image.

## VII.

In the Section of Justification *Monsieur de Meaux* has omitted this whole paragraph since his first Edition :

"The Catholick Church, says he, is no where  
"more invincible than in this point, and per-  
"haps it would need no long discourse to shew,  
"that the more one searches by the Scriptures  
"into the design of the redemption of Man-  
"kind, which was to make us Holy, the more  
"one shall approach to our Doctrine, and the  
"more depart from the opinions of *Calvin*,  
"which are not maintainable, nay are contra-  
"dictory and ruinous of all true and solid piety.  
"1 Ed. p. 36, 37.

*Monsieur de Meaux* may please some other time to  
expound to us, what those Opinions of *Calvin* in this  
matter are which the Church of Rome is so invinci-  
ble in, and which all parties among them will agree  
to be so contradictory, and ruinous to all true and  
solid piety, as he then said.

In

In the mean time we will only beg leave to observe on occasion of this Correction, that perhaps there are some in the Church of Rome of Mr. Calvin's mind in the worst of those Principles Monsieur de Meaux refers to, and to assure him that there are several Protestants in the World that are not; tho they dare not therefore so severely censure the Opinions of those that are.

IX.

Monsieur de Meaux having in a very few words explained the Doctrine of Justification, upon which the Council of Trent is so long and perplex'd, assured us in his first Exposition, That *that was enough for any Man to know to make him a through Christian.*

"Thus have you seen what is most necessary in  
"the Doctrine of *Justification*; and our Adver-  
"saries would be extraordinarily contentious  
"not to confess, that *there is no need to know any*  
"*more to be a solid Christian.* 1 Ed. p. 47.

This would have been of great advantage to us, and have freed us from the *Anathema's* of many other Particulars, of which we more doubt, than of any thing Monsieur de Meaux has expounded of it; but this others thought too great a Concession; and the Bishop therefore, without changing any thing in his *Premises*, was forced to draw a very different *Conclusion* from them.

"Thus have you seen what is most necessary in  
"the Doctrine of *Justification*, and our Adver-  
"saries

"saries would be very unreasonable if they  
 "should not confess, *that this Doctrine suffices to*  
 "*teach Christians, that they ought to refer all the*  
 "*Glory of their Salvation to God through Jesus*  
 "*Christ.*

## X.

In the Article of Satisfaction, Monsieur de Meaux speaking of the Temporal and Eternal Punishment of Sin, and how the one may be retain'd when the other is forgiven, had this Paragraph in the first Edition, since struck out.

"The Church has always acknowledged these  
 "two different manners of applying the Re-  
 "mission of Sins, which we have proposed;  
 "because she saw that in the Scriptures, besides  
 "the *first Pardon*, and which ought to be the  
 "only, if Men were not ungrateful, and which  
 "is pronounced in the terms of a *pure Remission*,  
 "there is *another Absolution*, and *another Grace*,  
 "that is proposed in form of a *Judgment*,  
 "where the Church ought not only to *loose and*  
 "*remit*, but also to *bind and retain*. 1 Edit.  
 "P. 54, 55.

The Censure pass'd upon this, were enough to make one suspect, that either Monsieur de Meaux, or his *Corractors*, were sensible upon further Consideration, that they could not so easily find out these *forms*, so distinguish'd in holy Scripture, or prove that the Church had always acknowledged them; and therefore judg'd it safer not to undertake it.



XI.

In the Article of *Confirmation*, speaking of the *Imposition of Hands*, Monsieur de Meaux insinuated in his first *Exposition*, that it had always been accompanied with the use of *Chrism* ever since the *Apostles*.

“Thus, says he, all Christian Churches have religiously retained this Practice, accompanying it (the Imposition of Hands) with holy *Chrism*. 1 Ed. p. 65.

This was too clearly false to be suffer'd to pass, and therefore it is now more loose, so as to admit of an *Equivocation*, and yet seem to say still the same thing.

“Thus all Christian Churches since the Apostles times have religiously retained it, making use also of holy *Chrism*.

XII.

In the Article of the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, Monsieur de Meaux having expounded it according to our Principles, in his first Edition, concluded with us too.

“So that it (the Mass) may, says he, be very reasonably called a *Sacrifice*: 1 Ed. p. 115.

But since the *Correction*, the Conclusion is much strengthened, tho the Premises remain the same:

“So that there is nothing wanting to it, to make it a true *Sacrifice*.

XIII.

As to the point of the Pope's Authority, the first Exposition ran much higher than it seems the Spirit of the Gallicane Church could bear.

"So that our Profession of Faith obliges us as  
 "to this point, to believe the Roman Church  
 "to be the *Mother and Mistress* of all Churches,  
 "and to render a *true Obedience* to the Pope, the  
 "Successor of *St. Peter*, and Vicar of Jesus  
 "Christ. 1 *Ed. p. 166.*

It is now more loose, and in general thus;

"We acknowledg a Primacy in the Successors of  
 "the Prince of the Apostles, to whom, for that  
 "cause we owe that Obedience and Submission  
 "which the holy Councils and Fathers have al-  
 "ways taught the Faithful. 5 *Ed. p. 210.*

But it may be what was struck out of the *Exposition* to please the *Correctors*, Monsieur de *Meaux* recompensed in his *Letter* to satisfy his *Holineſs*.

XIV.

In the Conclusion, Monsieur de *Meaux* telling us that none of those Articles he had expounded, according to our own Principles, destroyed the Foundation of our Salvation, added in his first Exposition what that Foundation was, *viz.*

"The

“The Adoration of one only God, Father, Son,  
“and Holy Ghost, and the Trust in one only  
“Saviour. 1 Ed. p. 160.

It is hard to say why this was not let pass, for we are unwilling to believe that the *Church of Rome has any other Foundation* for Salvation than this. But it may be to have put down this as the Foundation of Salvation, would have been too plainly to shew, that then we certainly have this, and that *without mixture of any thing destructive thereunto.*

XV.

Monsieur de Meaux go's on, in a very candid manner, since struck out ;

“In effect, says he, in all these Explications,  
“which contain the very bottom of our Belief,  
“there is not any one word repugnant to these  
“two Principles, either directly, or by Consequence.

“So that acknowledging then this, That  
“the Church of Rome do's believe and profess  
“all that is essential to preserve the substance  
“of the Christian Religion, so that they cannot  
“reasonably impute to us any Doctrine contrary thereunto, they must at the same time acknowledge, by their own Principles, that the  
“Church of Rome is a true part of the Church of Christ, to which every Christian is obliged to unite himself in his Heart, and in effect as far as in him lies. 1 Ed.

Monsieur

Monsieur de Meaux may please to know, that we do confess the Church of Rome to be a *part* of the *true Church*, tho' indeed we think *one of the worst*; and that we do with all our Hearts desire a Union with her; and in effect do shew it as far as we are able, by retaining whatever we can of the same Doctrines and Practices with her.

And if this were all they desired of us, as indeed it is all they ought, and all we can do: However an absolute Union would not thereby be obtained, yet might we live at least like Christians and Brethren, in a common Charity with one another, and to dispose our Minds, as by God's Grace to come in a little time to some better agreement in the rest too, than ever we are like to do without it.

These are some of those Passages that gave occasion to the *correction* we have spoken of at *the Sorbon*, and to the *suppression of the whole first Edition*, however *authorized by the Bishops of France* in the same words it now is. I might have added many more; but instead of it, will beg leave to offer the Reader one *Correction* made very lately by *another Faculty*, that of *Lowain*; if not immediatly of Monsieur de Meaux's *Exposition*, yet at least of a Doctrine which they were before-hand given to understand, was so explained in it.

Monsieur de Witte, Pastor and Dean of *St. Maries*, in the City of *Michlin*, having, in a Discourse with some Persons of that City, on the 8th of *July* last, maintain'd the *Authority of the Church and Pope*, according to the manner of Monsieur de Meaux's *Exposition*; complaint was made of him, first to the *Inter-noan*, then to his *Holiness* himself, and four  
Propo-

Propositions drawn up against him, as the Heads of his Heresy.

Monsieur de Wisse maintain'd his Opinion in several Papers, printed to that end; in the \* 4th of which, after several other Authorities of Persons of their Church defending the same Doctrine; He tells them,

[\* Intituled, Profectio probationis locum Mar. 16. non recte refundi in Apostolorum principis successores.]

"That the Golden Exposition of Faith of Monsieur the Bishop of Condom, required nothing more to the Sound, Catholic, and Orthodox Faith in this Matter; which Exposition, besides the Elogies of many other Eminent Persons, was also approved by our Holy Father Innocent the 11th himself, in his kind Letter to him.

Nihil præterea, ad sanam Catholicam, & Orthodoxam fidem deponit aures illa Expositio Catholice fidei Jacobi Episcopi Condomensis, præter Illustrissima Clarissimum Virorum Elogia, ipsius S. Patris Innocent. xi. peraman- tissimis literis comprobata.

But all this could not prevail with them to respect his Doctrine ever the more for Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, or his Holinesses Brief. The Faculty of Divinity, at the command of the Nonce, and with the knowledg, no doubt, and assent of the Pope, to whom the whole Affair had been communicated, censured his Propositions, Nov. 3. 1685. and especially the second, in which Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition of the Catholick Faith was principally concerned, as scandalous and pernicious.

"Judicamus eam censurari posse uti scandalosam & perniciosam.

May those who insist so much on the Fidelity and Authority of Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, please calmly to consider these things; and tell us how we can



can rely on such an *Exposition of their Doctrine*, as notwithstanding so many formal *Approbations*; first, of the Bishops of *France*, was yet corrected in so many places by the *Sorbon*; and secondly, of the *Pope*, *Cardinals*, and others in *Italy*; and of the whole Body of the *Clergy of France* in their Assembly; has yet so lately been censured, at the command of the *Nonce*, and with the consent of his Holiness, by the Faculty of one of their most eminent Universities, to be *scandalous and pernicious*.

---

# A Table

A  
I.  
IV  
V.  
VI  
VI  
V  
IX  
X  
X  
X  
X  
X  
X  
X

# T A B L E

## O F T H E

# A R T I C L E S

Contained in this T R E A T I S E.

		Page.
I.	<b>T</b> <i>He Introduction.</i>	3
	II. <i>That Religious Worship is to be paid to God only.</i>	6
	III. <i>Of the Invocation of Saints.</i>	9
IV.	<i>Of Images and Relicks.</i>	13
V.	<i>Of Justification.</i>	19
VI.	<i>Of Merits.</i>	21
VII.	<i>Of Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences.</i>	24

### P A R T II.

VIII.	Of the Sacraments in general.	33
IX.	Of Baptism.	35
X.	Of Confirmation.	39
XI.	Of Penance and Confession.	40
XII.	Of Extream Unction.	44
XIII.	Of Marriage.	45
XIV.	Of Holy Orders.	46
XV.	Of the Eucharist; and first of the Explication of those words, This is my Body.	47
XVI.	Do this in remembrance of Me.	54
	F	XVII.

## A TABLE.

XVII. <i>The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning this holy Sacrament.</i>	55
XVIII. <i>Of Transubstantiation, and of the Adoration of the Host.</i>	58
XIX. <i>Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.</i>	62
XX. <i>Of the Epistle to the Hebrews.</i>	67
XXI. <i>Reflections upon the foregoing Doctrine.</i>	69
XXII. <i>Of communicating under one kind.</i>	72

## PART III.

XXIII. <i>Of the Word written and unwritten.</i>	75
XXIV. <i>Of the Authority of the Church.</i>	76
XXV. <i>The Opinion of the Church of England, as to the Authority of the Church.</i>	80
XXVI. <i>The Authority of the holy See and of Episcopacy.</i>	81
XXVII. <i>The Close.</i>	82

## ERRATA.

**P**reface] Page xxix the number of the Sections mistaken to the end. P. xxxii. l. 15. dele 5 Ed. p. 210. P. xxxiv. l. 28. r. Mechin, ib. l. 33. r. Inter-mone. Book.] P. 13. l. 10. r. Praefati. P. 20. l. 5. r. works-it-kant. P. 22 in the Margin, l. 9. del. 16. P. 23. the same. P. 24. Marg. del. p. 66. P. 34. l. 18. r. Fortu. P. 36. l. 13. r. Mr. de Mauz. l. 14. Charity. P. 40. l. 13. r. Vertu. P. 69. Marg. ib. r. ver. 24.



AN  
EXPOSITION

OF THE

Doctrine of the Church of England

In the several Articles expounded by

Monfieur de MEAUX.

I. *The Introduction.*

IT has always been esteemed more reasonable to doubt of *Principles* first, and then to deny the *Conclusions* that are drawn from them, than having granted the Foundation, afterwards to cavil at the clear and necessary Deductions from it.

To profess "that *Religious Worship is due to God only*; and at the same time to say that we ought to adore Men and Women, Crosses and Images, and all that infinite variety of Follies which these latter Ages have set forth under the pious name of Relicks. To declare, "That we are *saved only by Christ's Merits*; and yet still continue to teach us that we ought to set up our own. In a word, to say, "That the Death of Christ was a perfect Sacrifice, and one drop of his Blood more than sufficient for the Redemption of Mankind;

“*kind*; and nevertheless go on to require our Satisfaction as necessary too, and oblige us to believe that other Propitiatory Sacrifices besides that of the Cross, ought to be offered up continually to God in his Church, for the Sins both of the Dead and the Living: This must certainly be the part of a Disputant, either too ignorant to understand, or too obstinate to submit to any Conviction.

Monfieur de Meaux, the design of whose Exposition seems rather to be an *Apology* for the Popish Religion, than a free *Assertion* and *Vindication* of its Errors, is above all things sensible of the Justice of this Reflection: and therefore endeavours by all means possible in the very entry of his Treatise to prepare his Reader against it, By shewing “*the Injustice of charging Consequences upon Men which they do not allow*; and that therefore tho their Superstructure “should chance to overthrow their Foundation, yet “since they profess not to know that it does so, they “ought not to be taxed with what they do not believe.

It is not deny'd but that Consequences may be sometimes either so obscure, or so far distant, that a Person prejudicate for the Principle, may well be excused the charge of a Collection, which his Actions shew he neither believes nor approves. But when the Conclusions, as well as Principles, are plain and confess'd, and the Dispute is only about the *Name*, not the *Thing*; we must beg leave to profess, that we cannot chuse but say that he believes not as he ought *the infinite Merits of Christ's Sacrifice*, who requires any *other Offering for Sin*; and that no subtilty of Argument will ever persuade us that those destroy not their Principle of *worshipping God only*, whom we see, contrary to his express Command, *prostrate every day*



day before an *Image*, with Prayers and Hymns to Creatures that have been subject to like Infirmities with our selves, and that are perhaps at this very time in a worse Estate, than the most miserable of those that call upon them for their assistance.

Be it therefore allow'd to be as great a Calumny, as Monsieur de Meaux can suppose it, to accuse Men of Consequences obscure and disavow'd; the Opinions we charge the Church of Rome with, are plain and confess'd, the Practice and Prescription of the chiefest Authority in it. And to refuse our Charge of them, is in good earnest nothing else than *to protest against a matter of Fact*; a Plea, which even Justice it self has told us, may without Calumny be rejected as invalid.

However, thus much at least we have got by this Reflection, that it directs us to the true State of the Controversy between us; and shews, That we, who have been so often charged by the Church of Rome as *Innovators in Religion*, are at last by their own confession, allow'd to hold the ancient and undoubted Foundation of the Christian Faith; and that the Question between us therefore is not, *Whether what we hold be true?* which is on all hands agreed, but, *Whether those things which the Roman Church has added as Superstructures to it, and which, as such, we reject, be not so far from being necessary Articles of Religion, as they pretend, that they indeed overthrow that Truth which is on both sides allow'd to be Divine; and upon that account ought to be forsaken by them?*

The Declaration of this, not so much by any new proof, as by clearing rather the true state of those Points which are the subject of our Difference, is the design of the following Articles; in which I shall  
endea-

endeavour to give a clear and free account of what we can approve, and what it is that we dislike in their Doctrine; and as far as the shortness of this Discourse will allow, touch also upon some of those Reasons that are the most usually given by us for both!

## ARTICLE II.

### *That Religious Worship is to be paid to God only.*

**T**HAT Religious Worship is due to God only, how necessary soever those Practices of the Roman Church, which we are hereafter to consider, may have rendred it to Monsieur de Meaux to declare, yet is it, we suppose, but little necessary for us to say,

We firmly believe, that “the inward acknowledgment of his Divine Excellencies as the Creator and Lord of all things, is a part of the supreme Worship that is due to him. We believe that all the Powers of our Soul ought to be tied to him by Faith, Hope, and Charity, so that God who alone can establish and make us happy. And tho we do not think that there is now any sensible, or material Sacrifice to be offered to Him under the Gospel, as there was heretofore under the Law; yet do we with all Antiquity suppose the Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving to be so peculiarly his due, that it cannot, without derogation to his Honour, be applied to any other.

What our Opinion is of that Worship which the Roman Church pays to the Blessed Virgin, and Saints departed,

departed, we shall hereafter fully shew: But certainly great was the difference of these *Holy Men* whom Monsieur de Meaux mentions as their fore-runners in this practice, from the present manner of the Popish Invocation. Gregory Nazianzen in a Rhetorical Apoprophe, called to *Constantius* in one, to his Sister *Gorgonia* in another Oration, but he prayed to neither. St. Basil; St. Ambrose; St. J. Chrysostom; St. Hierom; St. Augustin; they desired sometimes that the Martyr or Saint would joyn with them in their requests, but they were rather *Raptures* and *Wishes*, than direct Prayers; and their formal Petitions, but especially those of the Church, were only to God Almighty. They doubted whether the Saints could bear them or no; and were rather inclined to believe that they could not. The *Addresses of the Mind*, which the Church of Rome allows no less than the others to them, they look'd upon to be so peculiarly God's due, that they supposed he did not communicate them to the very Angels that are in Heaven. They declared against all thoughts of being assisted by the *Merits* of their Saints, or that God would ever the more readily, or indeed so soon accept their Prayers coming by the Intercession of another, as if they had gone themselves directly to the Throne of Grace. In a word; they never imagined that this was an Honour due to them; but, on the contrary, constantly taught that it was a Service belonging only to God Almighty.

Well therefore might \*Monsieur Daille refer the beginnings of this Invocation to these Men, whose innocent Wishes, and Rhetorical Flights, being still increased by the Superstition of after-Ages, first gave birth to this Worship. But certainly the *Romanists* cannot with any reason alledge them in favour of their

\* And that it is the most he dots; Se de Cult. Lat. l. 3. c. 18.

their Error, till it be shewn either that we are mistaken in those differences we have here declared to be between what they did, and what the Church of Rome now practises; or that they are otherwise proved to be so inconsiderable, as not to make any notable alteration in it. And yet that the Ages before knew nothing even of this, not only their confessed inability to produce any Proofs from them of this Superstition, but the contrary Testimonies of the undoubted Writings of *Ignatius, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Novatian*, and Others, so plainly shew, that it ought not to be esteemed at all rash at this distance to assert, that in this very small Change, *the Fathers of the fourth Century, did certainly begin to depart from the Practice and Tradition of those before them.* And if that Reason of the Church of Rome be of any strength, why they pray'd not to the Holy Men under the Old Testament, viz. *because they were not then admitted to the sight of God, and therefore ought not to be prayed to.* It seems to us that not only the greater part of the Primitive Fathers, but even those very Men *Monfieur de Meaux* mentions, could not certainly have allowed such an Invocation as is now used in their Church; the most of them being notoriously known, and even by their own Writers freely confessed, to have believed the same, *That neither do the Saints and Confessors of the Christian Church any more enjoy the Presence of God even now.*

Thus much was thought fit to be said to remove that Prejudice *Monfieur de Meaux* had thrown in the way. We go on now with him to consider the Doctrine it self, and what our Church's Opinion is of it.

## ARTICLE III.

### *Of the Invocation of Saints.*

THE Invocation of Saints, *as it is stated by Monsieur de Meaux*, we look upon to be one of those Practices which our Church stiles, "*fond things, vainly invented, and grounded upon no Warrant of Holy Scripture, but indeed repugnant to God's Word.*" *Artic. xxii.* Monsieur de Meaux himself dares not say that they do or can ordinarily by *any ability in themselves*, hear, see, or know, the Wants, State, or Prayers of Men upon Earth, to be mindfull of them unto God in Heaven. Nor can it ever be proved that by *any of those ways which he proposes*, but seems himself not to lay any great stress upon, they are certainly and particularly communicated to them.

We think therefore, that till this be cleared, it is a great a hazard to leave a Mediator, who both certainly knows our wants, and has promised to hear us; that has invited us, nay commanded us to come to him in all our Needs, to go to Intercessors which God has no where appointed, and which we can never be sure our Prayers shall come up to. It sufficeth not that they may know *some things, in some places, at some times, and of some Men extraordinarily*, unless we could tell *what Saints, and what things, and in what places, and at what times*, they do know them. When this is cleared, it may then be more reasonable to desire us to joyn with them in this Service. In the mean time, tho we should not charge

G

them



them with *Idolatri* meerly for this, yet we must needs confesse we cannot but think these Addresses to be too full of hazard and uncertainty to venture any Requests at all, much less so many as they do every day, upon them.

In vain therefore does Monsieur *de Meaux* endeavour to defend the *Innocence* of this Invocation, whilst he forgets to shew us the *Reasonableness* of it. We should be pleased indeed to be assured of that; but we cannot be convinced that we ought to joyn in the Practice till we are satisfied of the other too. And yet we cannot but regret, that if their design be truly no more than this, *to entreat the Saints to pray for them*, we should find the greatest part of their Service addressing to them after so contrary a manner; that they would interpose not only their *Intercessions*, but their *Merits* too for their forgiveness: Not only that they would *pray to God for them*, but that *they would themselves bless them*. That the Angels and "Saints would give them *Strength, Grace, Health, and* "Power. That St. Peter would have *Mercy upon them,* "and open to them the *Gate of Heaven*. That the Blessed "Virgin would protect them from their *Enemies*, and "ceive them at their *Death*: In a word, that she would "command her Son to forgive them by that *Right, which as* "a Mother she had over him. All which their very publick Rituals so far allow, that the Service which is paid to God in his Church by the *Mediation of Christ*, is infinitely exceeded by the Addresses of this nature, through the *Merits of the Virgin Mary, and of the Saints*.

Now if these Prayers signify no more than, as Monsieur *de Meaux* expounds them, *to entreat the Saints to pray for them*, why have we such Scandal given us in the Practice? If they intend really what

we

This Passage  
is often de-  
ny'd: See  
Cassander Con-  
sult. in Art. 21.

we suppose, and what their words do certainly signify; what Ingenuity can it be to impose upon us in the Declaration? However at least they will please to excuse us that we have fallen at so just a stumbling Block; and charged them as derogating from the Merits of Christ, whilst they have thus cry'd up the Merits of their Saints, and of a Presumption unwarrantable, if not wholly Idolatrous, in desiring any but God alone *to help, and succour, and give them those Blessings*, which God only has power to dispense.

1. When therefore we shall be certainly assured that all that infinite number which the Church of Rome has canonized, are truly and infallibly *Saints*.

2. When we shall be assured that these Saints do *already enjoy the Presence of God Almighty*; a Circumstance which the Papists themselves confess necessary to warrant their Invocation.

3. When it shall be made undoubtedly appear, that either by their *own Knowledge*, or by some *other Revelation*, they do *ordinarily and particularly understand all the Requests that are made to them*; so that we can be as secure of their hearing us, as when we desire our Brethren upon Earth to pray for us.

4. When the Liturgies of their Church shall be reformed, and all those dangerous Insinuations of the *Merit and Personal Assistance* of their Saints be removed.

5. When those desperate Doctrines, and yet more desperate Addresses of their School-men and Controversists, which scandalize the more moderate even of their own Party, shall be censured.

6. And Men taught to practise this Invocation with such Sobriety, as neither to make it so freely and publickly their Worship as they do, nor with any Opinion of being either *sooner heard, or more effectually*

ally answered by this way of Address, than by going directly to God by our Saviour and only Mediator Jesus Christ.

7. In a word, when even an Invocation so moderated, shall be shewn either to have been commanded by God Almighty, or to have been advised by his Apostles, or to have been practised *ordinarily and directly* by the most Primitive Christians: Or lastly, but to be no way injurious to the excellent Goodness of that Intercessor, who has so kindly invited, and even conjured us to come to Him in all our needs; Then will we not fail to joyn our *Ora pro Nobis* with them: But till then we must beg leave to conclude with a Charity and Moderation, which we suppose they themselves cannot but approve in us, *That it is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Holy Scripture, but rather indeed contrary thereunto.*

And what we have now said of their Prayers, we must in the next place apply to their Sacrifices too. *To mention the Names of the Holy Saints departed in the Communion*; this we look upon to be a Practice as innocent as 'tis ancient. So far are we from condemning it in them, that we practise it our selves. *We name them at our Altars, we give God thanks for their Excellencies, and pray to him for Grace to follow their Examples.* But as we allow thus much to their Memories, so we cannot but condemn that Practice which Monsieur de Meaux seems to have omitted, tho yet the chief thing that offends us; that they recommend the Offerings which they make to God, through *the Merits* of their Saints which they commemorate, and desire that by their Merits they may become available to the Churches needs. As if *Christ himself*, whom they suppose to be the *Sacrifice*, needed the  
Assistance

*Assistance of St. Bathildis or Potentiana*, to recommend him to his Father : Or, that the *Merits* of an Offering, which they tell us is the very same with that of the Cross, should desire the joynt *Deserts* of a *St. Martin* to obtain our Forgiveness.

They who shall consider these things as they ought, will, we doubt not, confess that we have some reason to complain, both that they derogate herein from Christ's Merits, and attribute to their Saints more than they ought to do. If this Practice be reformed, our Complaint, as to this point, ceaseth. If it be not, in vain does Monsieur *de Meaux* endeavour to perswade us, that they *only name their Saints to give God thanks for their Excellencies*, whilst their publick Practice avows, that they desire both the pardon of their Sins, and even the acceptance of their very Sacrifices themselves, by their Mediation.

## ARTICLE IV.

### *Of Images and Relicks.*

**W**Hat the Opinion of the Church of *England* is concerning the Worship of Images and Relicks, will need no long Declaration to shew, they being joyn'd by her in the same Article with that of the Invocation of Saints before-mentioned, and by consequence, submitted by her to the same Censure. Artic. XXII.

But then, as we before complained, that both the Practice of their Church in the publick Liturgies of it, and the approved Doctrine of their most reputed Writers, should so far contradict what Monsieur *de*

*Meaux*

*Meaux* would have us think is their only design in that Service; so we cannot but repeat the same Complaints in this: That if all the use their Church would have made of Images and Relicks, be *only to excite the more lively in their Minds the remembrance of the Originals*, not only the People should be suffered to fall into such gross Mistakes, as 'tis undeniably evident they do, in their Worship of them; but even their Teachers be permitted without any Reproof to confirm them in their Errors.

Has *St. Thomas* and his Followers, nay, and even their *Pontifical* it self, ever yet been censured by them, for maintaining in plain terms, that *the Image of the Cross ought to be worshipped with the same Worship as that Saviour who suffered on it?* Have the Jesuits been condemned for teaching Men to swear by it? Does not their whole Church upon *Good-friday* yet address her self to it in these very dangerous words, *Behold the Wood of the Cross! Come, let us adore it.* And do not their Actions agree with their Expressions, and the whole Solemnity of that day's Service plainly shew, that they do adore it in the utmost propriety of the Phrase? Does she not pray to it, that *in this time of the Passion, it would strengthen the Righteous, and give Pardon to the Guilty?* Is the Hymn for the day of the *Invention* corrected, wherein they profess that *the Cross heals their Sickneses, ties up the Devil, and gives them Newness of Life;* and thereupon desire it to save its Assembly, gathered together in its honour? Is the manner of consecrating them changed, in which they intreat God to bless the Image of the Cross which they there sanctify, that it may be for *the establishment of their Faith, an increase of their good Works, the Redemption of their Souls, and their Protection*



tection against the cruel Darts of the Enemy? That Christ would embrace this Cross, over which they pray, as he did that upon which he suffer'd: That as by that he delivered the whole World from its Guilt; so by the Merits of this, they who dedicate it may receive remission of their Sins. In a word, that as many as bow down before it, may find health both of their Souls and Bodies by it.

And is all this in good earnest no more than to excite more lively in our minds the remembrance of Him that loved us, and delivered himself to the Death for us, and to testify by some outward marks our acknowledgment of that favour, by humbling our selves in presence of the Cross, to declare thereby our submission to Him that was crucified.

Is not this rather, if not absolutely to fall into, yet certainly too nearly to approach to that which Monsieur de Meaux himself confesses to be Idolatry, viz. to trust in the Images as if there were some divinity or virtue joyned to them, and for which they not only shew all imaginable marks of outward Worship, by Kissings, Prostrations, and the like Ceremonies; but make as formal Addresses to them, and that in the publick Service of the Church, as to God himself?

How this allow'd practice can be reconciled with the prohibition of the Council of Trent, "Not to believe any Divinity or Virtue tied to their Images for which they ought to be adored; nor to demand any Grace of them, nor place any Trust or Confidence in them; Monsieur de Meaux may please to expound to us. In the mean time, as we are so far from condemning the making of all sorts of Images, that we think it not any Crime to have the Histories of the Gospel carved or painted in our very Churches, which the  
Walls.

Walls and Windows of several of them do declare: As we publickly use *the sign of the Cross* in one of our very Sacraments, and censure no Man for practising it, only without Superstition, on any other occasion: so we cannot but avow the Scandal that is given us by those Doctrines and Practices before mentioned; and that we think that Worship justly to be abolished which the Primitive Church abhorred, and which at this day scandalizes not only so great a number of *Christians*, but even our common Enemy the *Jew & Turk*: In a word, which is so far from being commanded by God, that it needs many nice Distinctions to render it not directly opposit to an expresse Prohibition; and is therefore if not down-right Idolatry to those who know how to direct their Intention aright, yet to the Simple and Ignorant, that is, to the much greater number, and the most zealous practioners of this Service, so very near it, that the Generality of the wisest *Papists*, no less than *We*, complain of it.

For the honour that is due to Reliques, no Protestant will ever refuse what ever the Primitive Church paid them; or may be fit to express the Honour we ought to retain for those Bodies that by Martyrdom have been made Sacrifices to God Almighty. If this be all Mr. de Meaux desires of us, we are ready to profess our Opinion, that we judg it to be neither offensive to God, nor fit to be scrupled by any good Man.

We believe that according to the Circumstances of the Times, the Church may "testify this Honour by  
 "more or less outward Signs and Marks of Respect.  
 "And we do with satisfaction read that Declaration  
 "of Mr. de Meaux, That we ought not to be servilely  
 "subjected to these outward Ceremonies, but to be  
 "invited by them to offer up to God that reasonable  
 service

"service, in Spirit and in Truth, which he requires of us. And if this be the State of the Question, we confess the Explication of it has taken away a great part of the difficulty.

But what then means the Council of *Trent*, to tell us, That we are not only to honour them, but to *worship* them too? That by doing so, we shall obtain many *Benefits* and *Graces of God*. That these sacred Monuments are *not unprofitably revered, but are to be sought unto for the obtaining their help and assistance; to cure the Sick, to give Eyes to the Blind, Feet to the Lame, and even Life to the Dead*. How comes it to pass that their Church not only honours them, which we could allow, but carries them in Processions, makes Offerings to them, gives Indulgences to such as shall go to visit them; prescribes Pilgrimages to them, swears by them, touches their Beads, or Hankerchiefs, with them to sanctify them; thinks to obtain one Blessing by virtue of this Relick, another from that; and the like superstitious usages, which we suppose we have good reason with our Church, to conclude to be "*fond things, vainly invented, and grounded upon no Authority* Art. xxii. "*of Holy Scripture, but indeed repugnant thereunto.*"

When therefore all these Abuses which we have named, and which Monsieur de Meaux seems content to allow with us to be such, shall be corrected: When in the matter of *Images*, 1. The Hymns and Addresses that teach us, so contrary to the Spirit of Christianity, to demand Graces of them, and to put our Trust in them, shall be reformed; St. *Thomas* and his Abettors censured; and all other Marks of an unwarrantable Worship be forbidden. 2. When the *Pictures of God the Father, and of the holy Trinity*, so directly contrary both to the second Commandment, and to St. *Paul's* Doctrine, shall be taken away, and those of our Saviour, and the blessed Saints be by all necessary Cautions rendred truly *the Books*, not

*Snares* of the Ignorant. When in points of *Relicks*, 3. they shall be declared to have no *sanctifying Virtue* in them: 4. Nor that they ought to be sought to for any Assistance Spiritual or Temporal to be expected from them. 5. When it shall be resolved to be no matter of *Merit to go to visit them*: 6. Nor any more extravagant Indulgences be set forth for Pilgrimages unto them: When all these things which Monsieur *de Meaux* passes over, and which yet are undeniably their Practice and our Scandal, shall be corrected; Then will we both believe and submit to the rest which he desires of us: We will *honour the Relicks of the Saints as the Primitive Church did*: we will respect the Images of our Saviour, and the Blessed Virgin: And as some of us now bow towards the Altar, and all of us are enjoined to do so at the Name of the Lord Jesus; so will we not fail to testify all due Respect to his Representation. In the mean time, if the Outcries of their own Church at these Abuses cannot prevail with them to redress them, yet at least they will confirm us in the Reformation we have made of them; and whilst we find *Hezekiah* commended in the holy Scripture for destroying the Brazen Serpent, tho' made by God's exprefs Command, and in some sort deservedly honourable for that great Deliverance it brought to the Jews, *Because the Children of Israel offered Incense unto it*. We shall conclude our selves to be by so much the more justifiable, in that the Images we have removed were due only to the *Folly and Superstition of Men*, and have been more scandalously abused, to a *worser and greater dishonour of God*.

2 King-18.

## ARTIC. V. Of *Justification*.

**T**HE Doctrine of *Justification* is one of those Points that deserves our careful Consideration ; as being not only one of the chiefest of those Points wherein we suppose the Church of *Rome* to have prevaricated the Faith, but as Monsieur de Meaux remarks, *one of the first that gave occasion to that Reformation* that was made from it:

It is not necessary to say to what an Extravagance the business of *Pardons, Indulgences*, and other means of *satisfying* the Divine Justice, was arrived ; and how much more confidence the People generally put in the Inventions of Men, than in the Merits and Satisfaction of Christ. If they have been somewhat better instructed since, they may thank the Reformation for it : tho we fear all the difference is, that they are somewhat more reserved in exposing these Follies now, but yet still retain the Foundation of that Doctrine upon which they are built.

We willingly allow Monsieur de Meaux this honour, that he has reduced the long Decrees of the Council of *Trent* to a short and easie Debate ; and proposed the things which contain our Difference with such tenderness, as might invite us to close with a great part of it, did not the Decrees of the Council seem too plainly to refuse Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition of them.

We believe with him, " That our Sins are freely forgiven by God's Mercy through Christ ; and that none of those things which precede our Justification, whether our Faith, or our good Works, could merit this Grace.

" We are perswaded that our Sins are not only covered, but are entirely done away by the Blood of Jesus Christ.

" We confess that the Righteousness of Jesus Christ is not only imputed, but actually communicated to the Faithful, through the operation of the holy Spirit, in



“ so much that they are not only reputed, but made just  
 “ by his Grace

“ We deny not that this Righteousness is a true Righteousness, even in the sight of God ; because that it is  
 “ God who by Charity works in us: only we think it  
 withal such as is too weak to obtain for us the pardon of  
 our Sins, which Monsieur *de Meaux* seems content to confess with us.

“ We willingly acknowledg that our Righteousness is  
 “ not perfect in this Life. Whilst we are in the Body,  
 “ the Flesh will lust against the Spirit, and in many things  
 “ we shall offend all. The Life of a Christian is a continued state of Repentance: and he must be too much  
 opiated of himself that refuses to conclude with St. *Augustine* ;  
 “ That our Righteousness in this Life, consisteth  
 “ rather in the Remission of our Sins, than in the Perfection of our Virtue.

In a word ; the sum of our Difference as to this Point, seems to be this. Our Church by *Justification*, understands only *the Remission of our Sins* : We distinguish it from *Sanctification*, which consists in the *production of the Habit of Righteousness in us*. We believe our Sins are pardoned only through the Merits of Christ imputed to us. And for the rest, we say, that this Remission of Sins is given only to those that repent ; that is, in whom the holy Spirit produces the Grace of Sanctification, for a true Righteousness and Holiness of Life.

The Church of *Rome* comprehends under the notion of Justification, not only *the Remission of Sins*, but also *the production of that inherent Righteousness*, which we call *Sanctification*. They suppose with us, that our Sins are forgiven only by the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ. But then as they make that inward Righteousness a part of Justification too ; so by consequence, they say our Justification it self is wrought also by our own good Works.

It

It appears by this, that were these things clearly stated, and distinguish'd the one from the other, the difference between us, considered only in the *Idea*, would not be very great: And that we might safely allow whatsoever Monsieur *de Meaux* has advanced upon this point, provided it be but well and rightly explained; tho in some things he has expressed himself after a manner unusual among us; and which we suppose not so entirely conformable to the Expressions of holy Scripture.

The sum of all is this. Christ died, and by that Death satisfied the Justice of God for us. God therefore through the Merits of his Son, freely forgives us all our Sins, and offers us a Covenant of Mercy and Grace. By this Covenant, founded only upon the Death and Merits of Christ, he sends us his Holy Spirit, and calls us powerfully to Repentance. If we awake and answer this Call, then God by his free Goodness justifies us; that is, he pardons our Sins past, gives us Grace more and more to fulfil his Commands for the time to come; and if we persevere in this Covenant, crowns us finally with Eternal Life. And all this he is pleased to do, not for any thing which we have, or can perform, but only through the Merits and Satisfaction of his Son by Faith applied to us.

This is the Foundation wherein Monsieur *de Meaux* seems content to agree with us. We go on to see how the following Doctrine will stand upon this Foundation.

## ARTIC. VI. Of Merits.

FOR what concerns the *Merits of Good Works*, we are content to accept of Monsieur *de Meaux's* Exposition; "That eternal life ought to be proposed to Man as the Grace of God mercifully bestow'd upon us through Jesus Christ, and as a recompence that is faithfully rendered

“dred to their good Works, and to the merits of them by  
“*virtue of Gods Promise.*

The word *Merit* we acknowledge to have been very antient in the Church; and tho to prevent those mistakes which many in these latter ages have made an occasion of that expression, we think it safer to discourse more reservedly of the *Merit*, and press more strongly the *Necessity* of good Works: Yet if it be understood so as Monsieur *de Meaux* expounds it, That all our Merit derives its force only from the Merits of Jesus Christ, who works in us both to will and to do; and when we have done, renders by the same Merits our good Works acceptable to God, and available to our Eternal Life, we shall not be difficult to allow of it.

If this be All the Church of *Rome* ascribes to Good works, that our Justification proceeds *absolutely* from God's Bounty and Mercy, and but *accidentally* only (in as much as God has tied himself by his Word and Promise to reward them) from our own Performances; We need no long exhortations to receive a Doctrine which we have always defended against such of the Church of *Rome* as have opposed it, and are not yet, that we know of, censured for their so doing.

That which we reject is, “That we do as *truly* and  
“*properly* merit Rewards when we do well, as we do me-  
“rit Punishment when we do ill: so says the Jesuit *Mal-*

Ezek. 18. *donate.* “That our Good Works do merit Eternal Life  
20. “*condignly, not only by reason of God's Covenant and Accep-*

“*tation, but also by reason of the Work it self;* so says Car-  
dinal Bellarmine. All which Vasquez sums up in the three

De Justif. following Conclusions; 1. “That the Good Works of just  
l. 5. c. 17. Vasquez in

D. Th. 1, 2<sup>a</sup> “Persons are *of themselves, without any Covenant or Accep-*

q. 114. d. “*tation, worthy of the reward of Eternal Life,* and have an  
214. c. 5. “equal value of Condignity to the obtaining of Eternal

16. c. 7. “Glory. 2. That there comes *no accession of Dignity* to

“the

“the Works of just Persons by the Merits or Person of  
 “Christ, which the same would not otherwise have, if they  
 “had been done by the same Grace bestowed freely by  
 “God alone without Christ. 3. That God’s Promise is 16. c. 8.  
 “indeed annex’d to the Works of just Men, but yet be-  
 “longs no way to the Merit of them, but cometh rather  
 “to the Works themselves, which are already not only  
 “worthy, but meritorious also. From all which he draws  
 this remarkable Corallary; “Seeing the Works of just  
 “Men do merit Eternal Life, as an Equal Recompence *Disp. 222. c.*  
 “and Reward, *3. n. 30, 31.* there is no need that any other condign Merit,  
 “such as that of Christ, should interpose, to the end that Eter-  
 “nal Life might be rendred to them.— Wherefore we never  
 “pray to God that by the Merits of Christ, the Reward  
 “of Eternal Life may be given to our worthy and me-  
 “ritorious Works; but that Christ’s Grace may be  
 “given to us, whereby we may be enabled worthily to  
 “merit this Reward.

This is that Doctrine of good Works which we most  
 justly do detest: And if the Opinion of the Church of  
 Rome be so directly opposite to it as Monsieur de Meaux  
 professes, we are a little surpris’d that no *Index Expurga-*  
*torius*, no authentick Censure, has ever taken notice of so  
 dangerous a Prevarication. But contrary-wise, these are  
 the great Authors of their Party, approved, embraced,  
 and almost adored, by the Greatest and most Learned of  
 that Communion.

These are the Principles which we suppose to have  
 been an unwarrantable derogation to the Grace of God,  
 and directly opposite to the nature of Justification by  
 Faith in Christ, before established. And tho this point  
 was far from being the only cause of our Separation from  
 their Communion, yet let Mr. de Meaux himself please  
 to say, whether such a Doctrine of Merits as this were  
 not sufficient, if not to engage us wholly to leave a  
 Church.

Church that taught such things, yet at least to dissent from her in these Particulars.

## ARTIC. VII, &c. Of Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences.

THE whole of this Point we think to be the advancement of a Doctrine grounded upon no Authority of Holy Scripture, but on the contrary, derogatory to God's Mercy in Jesus Christ, and, as the Doctrine of Merits before considered, inconsistent with the nature of that Justification we before establish'd.

Monsieur de Meaux was pleas'd there to tell us, of God's justifying us freely for Christ's Merits: That our Sins are not only covered, but entirely done away by his Mercy; and the Sinner not only reputed, but made just by his Grace. We cannot but be troubled to see our selves so soon deprived of this excellent Hope; and required our selves to satisfy God's Justice here, which he assur'd us was entirely done for us by Christ before.

See above  
p. 66.

"When Christ, says Monsieur de Meaux, who alone was able to make a sufficient Satisfaction for our Sins, died for us; having by his Death abundantly satisfied for them, he became capable of applying that Satisfaction to us after two very different manners; Either by giving us an entire Forgiveness of our Sins, without referring any Pains for us to undergo for them; or in changing only a greater Pain into a lesser, the Eternal Torments of Hell into a Temporal Punishment.

"The former of these being the more entire, and the more agreeable to the Divine Goodness, he accordingly makes use of it at our Baptism: But we suppose he gives the second only to them who after Baptism



Baptism fall again into sin ; being in a manner forced to it through the Ingratitude whereby they have abused his former Gitts, so that they are to suffer some *Temporal pain*, tho *the eternal* be remitted to them.

This is a very great Doctrine, and ought certainly to have some better Proof of it, than barely *We suppose*. However it be, our Church has declared its self of an opinion directly contrary : That since the absolute forgiving of sin is *Confessed* to be the more perfect way, and more becoming the Divine Goodness ; and that God has never, that we know of, revealed any other ; but rather has constantly encouraged us to expect his Pardon after the largest and most ample manner that it is possible for words to set forth ; We are persuaded that accordingly whenever God do's pardon, it is in that way which is the most suitable to his Divine goodness, and which alone he hath declared to us, that he do's it *intirely for Christs merits, not for any Works or Sufferings of our own*.

In vain therefore does Monsieur *de Meaux* labour to reconcile this Doctrine with Christ's absolute Satisfaction. "We confess that we ought not to dispute with  
" *God the manner of his Dispensations ; Nor think it at all*  
" *strange if he who shews himself so easie at our Baptism, is*  
" *afterwards more difficult for those sins which we commit*  
" *being Baptized*. There is nothing in all this but what we could most readily allow of, were there but any tollerable Arguments to establish the Doctrine that requires it.

But whilst this is so destitute of all Proof, that it is acknowledged to introduce a manner of forgiveness neither so *intire*, nor so *besitting Gods mercy* as a total remission of the Punishment, together with the Guilt ; whilst we have the Sufferings of Christ to re-

ly upon, which are so far from needing any addition of our own, that they are *Confessed* to have been *Super-abundant* to whatever the divine Justice could require of us; Tho we can and do practice the same Discipline for the other benefits of it, *viz.* To shew our Indignation against our selves that we have offended, and to keep us from sinning for the future; yet we cannot be so forgetful of our dear Master, as to pretend to any part in that Redemption, but only to enjoy the benefits of that forgiveness, which by his alone Merits he has intirely purchased for us; nor do we see any reason to believe that Gods Justice will require any more, than what has been *Super-abundantly paid* upon the Cross for the Iniquities of mankind.

'Tis true, Monsieur de Meaux tells us, "*That the necessity of this Payment does not arise from any defect in Christ's Satisfaction, but from a certain Order which God has establish'd for a salutary Discipline, and to keep us from offending.*"

This indeed were something, would either Monsieur de Meaux have been pleased to shew us this *Establishment*, or had not the Council of Trent declared more, *viz.* "*That the Justice of God requires it; and that therefore the Confessors should be charged to Proportion the Satisfaction to the Crime.*" From whence Cardinal Bellarmine concludes, "*That it is We who properly satisfy for our own sins, and that Christ's Satisfaction serves only to make ours Valid.*" This is an Exposition somewhat different from Monsieur de Meaux's, who will have the Church of Rome believe, "*That we do not our selves satisfy in the least for our sins, but only apply the infinite Satisfaction of Christ to them.*"

Upon the whole it appears, 1. That these Penan-  
ces

Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 14. c. 8.

L. 1. de purg.  
c. 14.

ces are not only a *Salutary discipline*, but a *Satisfaction* too. 2. They change the Mercy of God into a forgiveness, that is confessed neither to be in its self *Perfect*, nor so *becoming the Divine goodness* as an intire remission of sin, the Punishment as well as Guilt, would be. 3. Their Establishment depends only upon a *humane Supposition of its fitness*; and derogates from the very Foundation of that Covenant God has entred into with us by Christ, "*That he will be merciful to our unrighteousness, and our Sins and our Iniquities he will remember no more.*" Upon all which accounts, tho we Practise this Discipline for many other benefits of it, and wish it were universally Established, not only in a more perfect manner than either in Ours or Their Church it is, but even in a strictness equal to what they tell us it is fallen from; yet we cannot believe, that by any of these things we are able to make a true and proper Satisfaction to God for sin; which he only could do, "*who Himself bore our sins in his own Body upon the Cross, and by that one suffering, for ever perfected them that are Sanctified.*"

Hebr. c. 8. v. 12.

Catech. concil.  
Trid.

Hebr. 10. 14.

## ARTICLE VII.

### OF INDULGENCES.

**T**HE Doctrine of Indulgences the Council of Trent has asserted only, not explained: Monsieur de Meaux has stated it after a manner so favourable to us, that I am persuaded he will find more in his own Church than in ours to oppose his Doctrine.

It was the discipline of the Primitive Church, when the Bishops imposed severe Penances on the Offenders, and that they were almost quite performed, if some great cause of pity chanced to arrive, or an excellent Repentance, or danger of death, or that some Martyr pleaded in behalf of the Penitent, the Bishop did sometimes *Indulge* him, that is, *Did relax the remaining part of his Penance, and give him Absolution.*

Monsieur de Meaux having this Pattern before his Eyes, frames the Indulgences now used in the Church of Rome exactly according to it. "When the Church," says he, *imposes upon sinners hard and laborious Penances, and that with Humility they undergo them, this we call satisfaction; and when having regard either to the fervour of the Penitents, or to some other good works which she prescribes, she relaxes some part of the Punishment yet remaining; This is called Indulgence.*

But to pass by for the present those abuses that are every day made of these Indulgences, and which both the Council and Monsieur de Meaux seem willing to have redressed; such essential differences we conceive there are between the Indulgences of the Primitive, and those of the Roman Church, that tho we readily enough embrace the One, yet we cannot but renounce and condemn the Other.

In the Primitive Church these Indulgences were matters of *meer discipline*, as the Penances also were; the One to correct the sinner, and to give others caution that they might not easily offend; the Other to encourage the Penitent to honour the Martyr that interposed for his Forgiveness, or to prevent his dying without *Absolution*. In the Church of Rome they are founded upon an *Error*, in Doctrine; that as their Penance is not matter of Discipline, only to correct the

the sinner, but to be undergone as a satisfaction to be made to God for the sin ; so their Indulgence is not given as Monsieur *de Meaux* expounds it; upon any consideration had of *the fervour of the Penitent*, to admit him to Absolution which he has already received, but by the application of the *Merits of their Saints* who they suppose have undergone more temporal punishments than their sins have deserved, to take off that pain, which notwithstanding their Absolution, the sinner should otherwise have remained liable to.

In the Primitive Church the Bishop received the Penitent to Absolution, and the exemplariness of his Repentance, or the intercession of the Martyr that supplicated for him, was the only consideration they had for the Indulgence. In the Church of *Rome* the Indulgence is to be had from the Pope only, in whose hands the merits of their Saints lye, the overplus of which are, they say, the *Treasure of the Church*, to be dispensed upon all occasions to such as want, and upon such terms as his Holiness shall think fit to propose.

In the Primitive Church these Indulgences were very rare, given only upon some special occasions, and the Bishop never relaxed the remainder of the Penance he had imposed, till the Penitent had performed a considerable part of it, and shew'd by his contrition that it had obtained the effect of bringing him to a sense of his sin, and a hearty repentance for it, which was the end they designed by all. In the *Roman Church* they are cry'd about the Streets, hung up in Tables over every Church Door, prostituted for Money, offer'd to all Customers, for themselves or for their Friends ; for the dead as well as the living ; and to visit three Churches, say a Prayer before this Altar, at the other Saints Monument, in a third Chappel, is without more

add



ado, through the extraordinary Charity that Church hath for sinners, declared sufficient to take off whatever such Punishment is due for all the sins of a whole Life.

See our 22d  
Artic.

And here then let Monsieur de Meaux in conscience tell us ; *"Is all this no more than to release some part of the remaining Penance, in consideration of the fervour of the Penitent in performing the rest ? Such Pardons as these we do certainly with Reason conclude, To be fond things, vainly invented, and grounded upon no Authority of Holy Scripture, but indeed repugnant to Gods Word.* But for the rest, We profess our selves so far from being enemies to the Ancient Discipline of the Church, that we heartily wish to see it revived ; *And whenever the Penances shall be reduced to their former practice, we shall be ready to give or receive such an Indulgence as Monsieur de Meaux has described, and as the Primitive Ages of the Church allow'd of.*

## ARTICLE VIII.

### Of PURGATORY.

**B**UT the Temporal Pains which they suppose due to sin, has yet another Error consequent upon it. That since every man must undergo them according to the proportion of his sins, if any one chance to dye before he has so done, he cannot pass directly into Heaven, but must undergo these punishments first in the other Life, and the place where these Punishments are undergone, they call *Purgatory*.

So that the Doctrine then of Purgatory, relies upon that Satisfaction which we our selves are to make for our sins, besides what Christ has done for us: And according to the measure that that is either true or false, certain or uncertain, this must be so too: Since therefore Monsieur de Meaux tells us only, that the Church of Rome supposes the former to be true, they can only suppose the latter in like manner; and therefore till they are able certainly to assure us of that, we shall still have reason to doubt of this.

That the Primitive Church from the very second Century, made *Prayers for the dead*, we do not deny; But that these Prayers were to deliver them out of Purgatory, this we suppose Monsieur de Meaux himself will not avow; it being certain that they were made for the best Men, for the Holy Apostles, the Martyrs and Confessors of the Church, nay for the Blessed Virgin her self, all which at the same time they thought in happiness, and who the Papists themselves tell us never toucht at Purgatory.

Many were the private Opinions which the particular Christians of old had concerning the Reason and Benefit of *Praying for the dead*. Some then, as we do at this day, only gave thanks to God for their Faith and their Examples. Others prayed for them, either for the Bodies Resurrection, or for their acquitting at the final Judgment, as supposing it to be no way unfit to pray to God for those very Blessings which he has absolutely promised and resolved to give. Some thought an Increase of Glory might be obtained to the Righteous by their Prayers. All believed this, that it testified their hope of them, and manifested their Faith of that Future Resurrection which they waited for; and in the mean time maintained a kind of Fellowship  
and

and Communion between the Members of Christ yet alive, and those who were departed only, not lost by death.

But then it is to be observed, that when they most ordinarily prayed for the dead, yet was there nothing *determined* as to this Point; all was left to the Piety and Opinion of *particular men*, nor durst they absolutely resolve whether the dead received any benefit by them; as both the learned of the Church of *Rome* themselves Confess, and the Writings of Primitive Antiquity, even to St. *Augustine* himself, undoubtedly shew.

Now as there is none of us that will condemn the Charity of any man, to pray, or fast, or afflict himself for the Pardon and Forgiveness of his Friends, his Countrey, or his Church, so it be done without any fond Opinion of *Merit* or *Satisfaction*, and to hope too by such Prayers to obtain God's mercy for them: So if any one will put up his particular Requests for the dead too, for any of those ends for which the Primitive Christians did, we shall not condemn him. Only let not that be made an *Article of our Faith* which we can never be assured of, and which when it was most Practised, was received only as a *private Opinion*, and in a Sense far different from what is now asserted; And for the rest *We shall not refuse to Consent to any Liberty whereby Peace may be obtained, and our free Justification by Faith in Christ not injured.*

## PART II.

# OF THE SACRAMENTS.

## ARTICLE IX.

### *Of the Sacraments in General.*

**T**HE Doctrine of the Sacraments has always been esteemed one of the most considerable obstacles to our union with the Church of *Rome*. We cannot imagine why Monsieur *de Meaux* should insinuate as if our disputes about these, except it be in the point of the Eucharist, *were not so great as about other matters*, unless it be to serve for an excuse for his own passing so lightly over them, or to make us less careful in examining their Doctrine.

The *Sacraments* of the New Testament, in that *proper sense* in which we now take the word, we have always look'd upon to be not only "Holy Signs to represent and confirm to us the Grace of God, but also effectual Tokens of his good Will to us, by which he does work invisibly in us, and strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

To obtain the benefit of the Holy Sacraments, we cannot believe it to be enough that we have *no ill*

K

*disposi-*

## Of the Sacraments in General.

Artic. 25. of  
the Ch. of En.

*disposition*, but do suppose that it is a sufficient Obstacle if we have not a *good one*. We confess that the Faith of the Church, and those who present them to Baptism, is all that is required to prepare Infants to receive the spiritual Regeneration which that Sacrament confers. But for those who by age are capable of it, we suppose both in Baptism and in the holy Eucharist, an actual faith of Gods Promise annexed to the outward signs which we receive, to be indispensably necessary for the partaking of their effects.

And tho if the rest be agreed, we shall not desire to determine any mans belief, as to the *manner* how the Sacraments confer that Grace which God has promised by them ; yet we judg it more agreeable to the Analogy of our Faith to say, That upon the performance of the outward Ceremony, God bestows the inward Blessing ; than that the Blessing is conferr'd by *Virtue of the Words which are pronounced, and the action which is done to us*, as Monsieur de Meaux has expounded it.

¶ So our Chu.  
Catechism.

We do not by this at all take off from the necessity of the outward signs. We confess, " That besides the " inward Preparation, there is required for our Sanctification *a special operation of the holy Spirit, and an " application of Christs Merits by the means of the holy Sacraments*. This we are so perswaded of, that we profess them to be *necessary to Salvation*; infomuch that whosoever either carelessly neglects, or presumptuously despises the use of them, will in vain expect it by any other means.

For the number of the Sacraments, we acknowledg *only two as generally necessary to Salvation*; and are surpriz'd to see the Council of Trent damning all such as will not receive a number, which neither has the Scripture any



any where declared; nor was it, that we know of, till the very 12<sup>th</sup> Century ever heard of in the Church.

\* *Hugo de St. Victor* is the first that we can find it in, 1130 Years after Christ; || *Lombard* and the Schoolmen follow'd him. Pope † *Eugenius* in his instructions to the *Armenians* gave yet more countenance to it; but that all those Ceremonies which the Church of *Rome* now receives are truly and properly Sacraments, and that there be neither more nor less than *Seven*, never any one absolutely determined, till the Council of *Trent* first Canonically decreed it, and commanded the Church under an *Anathema* to receive it.

\* De Cerm. Ec.  
&c. l. 1. c. 12.  
|| Lib. 4. Sent.  
Dist. 2.  
† Ann. 1439.  
in Conc. Flor.

The special consideration of their *five pretended Sacraments*, will give us an opportunity more particularly to establish that number we our selves propose.

This presumption of the truth we must not omit here, That not only the Ancient Fathers of the Church when they speak of the Sacraments *properly* as we now do, mention only *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper*; but even the *Papists* themselves who establish more, yet confess these to be so far the Principal, that our own *Article* says but little more, than what their greatest *Schoolmen* have voluntarily confessed.

## ARTICLE X.

### Of BAPTISM.

HOW strict our Church is in maintaining the necessity of Baptism, the very Office by which we do administer it, sufficiently shews. We declare that "all men are conceived and born in sin, and that

See our Office  
Of Pub. Bapt

*"none can enter into the Kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of Water, and of the Spirit. This is the Law of Christ which the Eternal Truth has established; and whosoever shall presume to oppose it, let him be Anathema.*

∴ Ep. 70. if it  
be indeed his.

But now as all other Laws, so this of Christ, must, we think, be interpreted according to the rules of natural Equity. The Ancient Church constantly professed her belief, that Martyrdom excused the defect of Baptism. Many of the Papists themselves suppose, that *the desire of it*, when by some unavoidable necessity the Sacrament its self cannot be obtained, shall be reputed for it. Monsieur de Meanx insinuates that *the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity*, may supply the want of it. ∴ St. Bernard plainly concludes the same, "If, says he, a man *desirous* of Baptism be suddenly cut off by Death, in whom there wanted neither sound *Faith*, nor devout *Hope*, nor sincere *Charity*; God be Merciful unto me, and pardon me if I err, but verily of *such a Ones Salvation in whom there is no other defect but his faultless lack of Baptism*, despair I cannot, nor induce my mind to think his *Faith* void, his *Hope* confounded, and his *Charity* fallen to nothing, only because he hath not that which not *contempt, but impossibility* with-holdeth.

When therefore so many ways have been allowed to excuse the defect of Baptism, tho our Church has rather taken all imaginable care that Infants shall not die without it, than presumed rashly to determine what shall become of them if they do; yet we cannot but condemn the uncharitableness of the Church of Rome in *"Excluding them from all Part in Jesus Christ*, and denying that Mercy to a tender and impotent Age, which they so liberally extend to those of Riper years.

If

If not the *Want* but the *Contempt* of this Sacrament be the only thing that is damnable, to be sure no Contempt of Baptism can be in them. If the desire of Baptism in those that are capable of it, is by many of the Church confessed to be reputed for Baptism; why shall we not hope that God who is all merciful, will accept the *Desire* of the Church and of their Parents in their behalf, who by their Age are not capable to have any of their own. || If *Faith, Hope* and *Charity*, as Monsieur *de Meaux* himself implies, may excuse them who actually have these Graces, tho they want this Sacrament; why may not that Faith, that Hope, that Charity of the Church, which being imputed to them renders them capable of Baptism, be as effectual to stand instead of it to them, as their own proper Faith for Others, if a necessity which could not be avoided prevents it?

|| By Monsieur de Meaux, see before.

In a word, Since such is the Mercy of God, that to things altogether impossible he bindeth no man; but where what he Commands cannot be performed, accepteth of our Will to do it instead of the Deed.

2. Seeing God's Grace is not so absolutely tyed to the Sacraments, but that many exceptions have been, and are still Confessed to be sufficient to obtain it, without the external Application of them: Seeing, 3. *St. Paul* has told us that *the Seed of faithfull Parentage is Holy from the very Birth*, as being born within the Covenant of Grace; Tho we determine nothing, yet we think it the part of Charity, not only to take all the Care we can to Present our Infants to Baptism whilst they live, but if by any unavoidable necessity they should die without it, || to Hope well of them: Remembring that Judgment of God, *Exod. 4.* who when *Moses* neglected to Circumcise his Son, spared the Child in

I Cor. 7.

|| See Cassan. Consult.

Art. 9. & de Bapt. Infant.

Where he cites many others of the C. of R. of the same Opinion.

that

that he was innocent, but sought to kill *Moses* for his Carelessness in the Omission.

A necessity therefore of Baptism we constantly maintain; but absolutely to determine that all those who die without it, are excluded from the Grace of Christ, neither will Monsieur *de Meaux* presume to do of Men, nor dare we much less to affirm it of Infants. The *Lutherans* condemn the *Anabaptists* for refusing Baptism altogether to Children, which we also condemn in them. But that therefore they make no allowance for extraordinary Cases, where both the Church and the Parents desired to have Baptized them, only that some unavoidable Accident prevented it, neither did *Cassander* believe, nor do the terms of their Confession at all require. For the *Calvinists*, so far were they from being the Authors of this charitable opinion towards Infants dying unbaptized, *That many of the most Eminent men of the Church of † Rome have long before them maintained the same.*

Consult. Art. 9.  
† Gerson. Gabriel Biel, Cajetan, and others.

To conclude, If Monsieur *de Meaux* himself do's in good earnest believe the danger so great as he pretends; may he then please to consider, *What we are to Judge of those who in so many places have not left any Ministers at all to confer this Sacrament.* For our parts we freely declare their hazard to be infinitely greater than either the Childrens or their Parents; who are so far from that indifference Monsieur *de Meaux* most injuriously charges them with, that in places where publick Ministers reside, that they have the opportunity to do it, they fail not with all imaginable Care to Present them in the Ambassadors Chappels to Baptism, if they have but the least apprehension that they are not in a Condition to be carried to their own Temples.

## ARTICLE XI.

## Of CONFIRMATION.

**T**O clear our way to that particular Examination that is necessary of the following pretended *Sacraments* of the *Roman Church*, it will be necessary to observe, that by their own Confession these three things are absolutely required to the *Essence* of a true *Sacrament*. 1. *Christ's Institution*. 2. *An outward and visible Sign*. 3. *An inward and spiritual Grace* by *Christ's* promise annexed to that Sign.

We cannot but admire, that neither in the Council of *Trent*, or in the Catechism made by its Order, is there any Attempt to prove either of these from the Holy Scripture as to the Point of Confirmation. It was so much the more necessary to have done this, in that *Many* of the greatest Note in the *Roman Church* had denied the *Divine Institution* of it; and some of them were approved by the *Holy See* its self that did it. The outward Sign has been none of the least Controversies that have exercised their own Pens: and indeed since they have laid aside that of *Imposition of hands* which they confess the Apostles used; it was but reasonable to have shewn us some Authority for that other they have established in its stead. What Monsieur de Meaux expounds, is a clear Vindication of our Practice, but defends nothing of their own Doctrine.

That we think it to have been an Ancient custom in the Church, and which the very Apostles themselves



## Of Penance and Confession.

selves Practised, to *lay hands* on those that had been Baptized; and in imitation whereof we our selves at this day do the like, the Practice of our Church sufficiently declares.

We Confess that the use of *Chrism* in Confirmation was very Ancient, yet such as we deny to have been *Apostolical*. We do not our selves use it, yet were that all the difference between us, we should be far from judging those that did.

The Discipline of our Church allows none that is not of the Episcopal Order to Confirm. And for the benefit of it, as the Bishop prays to God for his Holy Spirit to assist us in the way of Virtue and Religion, to Arm us against Temptation, and to enable us to keep our *Baptismal Covenant which we then* (our selves repeat, and) *in the Presence of the Church openly ratifie and confirm*. So we Piously hope that the Blessing of the Holy Spirit descends upon us, through his Prayer, for all these great Ends; both to strengthen the Grace we already have, and to increase it in us to a more plentiful degree.

## ARTICLE XII.

### Of Penance and Confession.

**F**OR Penance and Confession, we wish our Discipline were both more strictly required, and more duly observed than it is. The *Canons of our Church* do perhaps require as much as the Primitive Christians themselves did: and it is more *the decay of Piety* in the People, than any want of Care in her, that they are not as well and regularly Practised. We

We do not believe *Penance* to be a Sacrament after the same manner that Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are; because neither do we find any Divine Command for it, nor is there any Sign in it established by Christ, to which his Grace is annexed. We suppose that if the Ancient Church had esteemed it any thing more than a part of Christian Discipline, they would not have presumed to make such changes in it, as in the several Ages it is evident they did.

The Primitive Christians interpreting those places of † *St. Matthew* and *St. John* which *Monsieur de Meaux* † *Mat. 18. 18.* mentions, of publick Discipline, and to which we suppose *John 20. 23.* with them they principally at least, if not only refer, as *first Practised* no other. For private faults, they exhorted their Penitents to Confess them to God, and unless some particular Circumstances required the Communication of them to the Priest, plainly signified that that Confession was not only in its self sufficient, but in effect was more agreeable to Holy Scripture, than any other.

If the Conscience indeed were too much burdened by some *Great fault*; or that the Crime committed was *notoriously Scandalous*, then they advised a Confession to the Priest too. But this was not to every Priest, nor for him just to hear the Confession, and then without more ado to say *I absolve thee*; They prescribed in every Church some Wise Physician of the Soul on purpose for this great Charge, that might pray with the Penitent; might direct him what to do to obtain Gods favour; might assist him in it; and finally, after a long Experience, and a severe Judgment, give him Absolution.

This was the Practice of the *Eastern Church*; till upon occasion of a certain scandal, *Nectarius* first began to weaken it in his Church at *Constantinople*; and *St. J. Chrysostome* his Successor seconded him in it. They reduced the Practice to what it had been in the Beginning; that open and scandalous Sins should be openly punished by the publick Discipline of the Church, and the private be Confessed only to God Almighty.

L

Yet

## Of Penance and Confession.

Yet still the publick Confession remained in the Practice of the *Western Church*. *Pope Leo I.* to take away the occasions of Fear and Shame that kept many from the exercise of it, first ordered, that it should be sufficient to Confess to God and the Priest only; which is the first plausible Pretence offered by them for Auricular Confession.

Thus this Practice, now set up for a Sacrament instituted by our Saviour, and absolutely necessary to obtain God's pardon, first began. But the performance of it was yet left to every Mans liberty. About 1215 Years after Christ, the Council of *Lateran* first Commanded it to be of necessary observance: But we do not find that till the Council of *Trent* in the last Age, it was ever required to be received absolutely as a Sacrament of Divine Institution, and necessary to Salvation.

This short View of the Practice of Antiquity in this point, may be sufficient to shew, that unless it were the publick power of the Church to censure open and scandalous Offenders, which was the Key of Discipline our Blessed Saviour left to it; for the rest, several Churches and Ages had their several Practices. They advised private Confession as upon many accounts which *Monfieur de Meaux* Remarks, and which we willingly allow, very useful to the Penitent: but it was not for above a 1000 Years ever looked upon as absolutely necessary, nor by Consequence as *Sacramental*.

The *Church of England* refuses no sort of Confession either publick or private, which may be any way necessary to the quieting of mens Consciences; or to the exercising of that Power of binding and loosing, which our Saviour Christ has left to his Church.

We have our Penitential Canons for publick Offenders: We exhort men if they have any the least doubt or scruple, nay sometimes tho they have none, but especially before they receive the Holy Sacrament, to Confess their sins. We propose to them the benefit not only of Ghostly

Advice how to manage their Repentance; but the great comfort of *Absolution* too, as soon as they shall have compleated it.

Our form of Absolution after the manner of the Eastern Church at this day, and of the Universal Church for above 1200 Years, is *Declarative* rather than *Absolute*. Whilst we are unable to search the Hearts of men, and thereby infallibly to discern the sincerely contrite, from those that are not; we think it Rashness to pronounce a *definitive Sentence in God's Name, which we cannot be sure that God will always confirm.*

When we visit our Sick, we never fail to exhort them to make a *special Confession* of their sins to him that Ministers to them: And when they have done it, the *Absolution* is so full, that the Church of *Rome* its self could not desire to add any thing to it.

For the rest; We think it an *unnecessary Rack to mens Consciences* to oblige them where there is no scruple, to reveal to their Confessor every the most secret fault, even of Wish or Desire, which the Church of *Rome* exacts: Nor dare we pronounce this Discipline *Sacramental*, and *necessary to Salvation*; so that a contrite Sinner, who has made his Confession to God Almighty, shall not receive a Pardon, unless he repeat it to the Priest too.

This we must beg leave with assurance to say is directly contrary to the Tradition of the Church, and to many plain and undoubted places of Holy Scripture. And if this be all our Reformation be guilty of, That we advise not that which may Torment and Distract, but is no way apt to settle mens Consciences; nor require that as indispensably necessary to Salvation, which we find nowhere commanded by God as such, we assure Monsieur *de Meaux* we see no cause at all either to regret the Loss, or to be ashamed of the Change.



## ARTICLE XIII.

*Of Extreme Unction.*

**O**F all those pretended Sacraments of the Roman Church that have no foundation in holy Scripture, this seems to stand the fairest for it. Here is both an outward and visible Sign, and an inward and spiritual Grace tied to it. Infomuch that Monsieur de Meaux himself, who never attempted to say any thing of it in the two foregoing Instances, yet fails not to put us in mind of it in this.

1 James 3. 6,  
14. 13.

To interpret rightly that place of St. James which is alledged to prove it, we must remark, that *anointing with Oyl* was one of those Ceremonies used by the Apostles in working their miraculous Cures, Mark 6. 13. *They cast out devils, says the Evangelist, and anointed many sick persons with Oyl, and cured them.* Sometimes they used only *Imposition of hands*, and sometimes they did it without either.

Together with these outward signs they usually added Prayer too, some Invocation at least in the name of Jesus Christ, as the more substantial and more effectual Assistance.

So that St. James's Direction there, "*If any man be sick let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oyl in the name of the Lord, and the Prayer of Faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up;*" referring as is evident to those miraculous cures which the Apostles and their Successors in the Primitive Church wrought by such anointing: We look upon it, that the advice, in as much as it belonged to that, could neither have been the Institution of a Sacrament at all; and that together with the miraculous power of healing, it is now long since ceased in the Church.

• Vid. Sacram.  
Grge. p. 66 Et  
Rursus 251. &  
serqq. Menard.  
annot. 3 MSS.  
Ægalia ejusde.  
opin.

Monsieur de Meaux ought not to refuse this Interpretation: The Ancient Rituals of the Roman Church for above 800 Years after Christ, shew that they esteemed this to be the meaning of it; they understand it plainly of bodily



bodily Cures, and Cardinal *Cajetan* himself freely confesses that it can belong to no other. Cajet. Annor. in loc.

Our Saviour and his Apostles, when they thus miraculously healed the infirmity of the Body, at the same time forgave the sin of the soul too; For this cause St. *James* adds, "*And if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.*"

Tho this extraordinary Power be now ceased both in the One and the other kind, yet we still endeavour to perform whatever we are capable of on these occasions; We send for the Elders of the Church when we are sick, they pray over us; if we stand charged with any private sins, or publick Censures, we confess them to them, and they sail not by their Absolution; as far as in them lies, to forgive us.

This is all, we think, is now remaining for us to fulfil of what this Text requires; We *anoint* not our sick for the recovery of their *bodily health*, as St. *James* here prescribed, because the miraculous power of healing, to which that Ceremony ministred, is ceased in the Church. We pray over them if it please God for the recovery of their present Health, but especially for their Eternal Salvation: We exercise the power of the Keys to the forgiveness of their sins, because the benefit of this is the same now that ever it was; Christ's Promise remains, and whilst we piously make use of the same means, we doubt not but it shall be to the like Effect.

## ARTICLE XIV.

### OF MARRIAGE.

FOR the point of Marriage, Monsieur de *Meaux* says: nothing but what we willingly allow of: We deny that it is a Sacrament after the same manner that Baptism and the holy Eucharist are, because it both wants an *ont-* :: Lomb. of our side. See Casland, Con-

## Of Holy Orders.

*ward sign* to which by Christs Promise a *Blessing* is annex'd; and is so far from being *generally necessary to Salvation*, as they are, and as we suppose all true and proper Sacraments ought to be, that the Church of *Rome* has thought fit to deny one of the most considerable parts of their Communion altogether the use of it.

## A R T I C L E X V.

### Of Holy Orders.

**T**HE *Imposition of Hands* in holy Orders, being accompanied with a Blessing of the Holy Spirit, may perhaps upon that account be called a kind of *Particular Sacrament*. Yet since that Grace which is thereby conferr'd, whatever it be, is not common to all Christians, nor by consequence any part of that federal Blessing which our Blessed Saviour has purchased for us; but only a separation of him who receives it to a special Employ; we think it ought not to be esteemed a common Sacrament of the whole Church, as *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper* are.

The outward sign of it we confess to have been usually *Imposition of hands*, and as such we our selves observe it; Yet as we do not read that Christ himself instituted that sign, much less tied the promise of any certain Grace to it; so Monsieur *de Meaux* may please to consider, that there are many of his own *Communion*, that do not think it to be essential to *holy Orders*, nor by consequence the *outward sign* of a Sacrament in them.

We confess that no man ought to exercise the Ministerial Office till he be first consecrated to it. We believe that it is the Bishops part only to Ordain. We maintain the distinction of the several Orders in the Church; and tho we have none of those below a Deacon, because we do not read that the Apostles had any, yet we acknowledge the rest to have been anciently received in the Church, and shall not therefore raise any controverſie about them.

Article

## ARTICLE XVI

## Of the EUCCHARIST.

*And first of the Explication of those Words, This is my Body.*

**I**N our entry upon this Point, we cannot but testify our just regret, That this holy Sacrament which was designed by our Blessed Saviour not only to be the greatest assurance of his love to us, but the strongest Engagements of our Charity to one another, should have become the chiefest subject of our contentions, and widened that breach which it ought to have closed.

Monsieur de Meaux who grounds his opinion of the Corporeal presence of Christ in this Holy Eucharist, upon the words of Institution, which he contends ought to be literally understood, yet proposes two Cases wherein he seems to allow it might have been lawful to forsake the Letter. We will join issue with him upon his own terms, and shew, "1. That there are such grounds in those words for a figurative interpretation, as naturally lead to it. 2. That when we come to consider the Intention of our Saviour in this holy Sacrament, we are yet more strongly confirmed in it.

It is confessed by the greatest Authors of the Church of Rome, that if the relative *This* in that proposition, *This is my Body*, refers to that Bread which our Saviour Christ held in his hand at the time when he spoke those Words, the natural repugnancy there is between the two things affirmed of one another, *Bread* and *Christ's Body*, will necessarily require the figurative interpretation. For "this is impossible, says || Gratian, That Bread should be the Body of Christ. It cannot be, says: Card. Bellarmine, That

that proposition should be true, the former part whereof designeth Bread, the later the Body of Christ. † So that if the Sense be, This Bread is the Body of Christ, either it must be taken Figuratively thus, This Bread signifies the Body of Christ, or it is plainly absurd and Impossible.

|| Gratian de Consecrat. d. 2. c. 55. l. 3. de Euch. c. 19. SS. Primum. † Id. ib. l. 1. c. 1.

The whole difficulty therefore as to our first point consists

lists in this, Whether our Saviour Christ when he said, *This is my Body*, meant any thing else to be his *Body*, than that *Bread* which was before him.

Now for this, the Connexion of his discourse seems to us an evident Demonstration. "*Our Saviour Christ took Bread, and gave Thanks, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, Take, Eat, This is my Body which is given for you; do this in Remembrance of me.*"

Luk. 22. 19.

For what did he demonstrate here, and say was his *Body*, but that which he gave to his *Disciples*? What did he give to his *Disciples*, but that which *He brake*? What brake he, but that which he took? And St. Luke says expressly he took *Bread*.

What Jesus took in his hands, that He blessed: what He blessed, the same He brake and gave to his *Disciples*: What he gave to his *Disciples*, of that he said, *This is my Body*: But Jesus, says the Text, took *Bread*; of the *Bread* therefore he said, *This is my Body*.

In a word; Forasmuch as the Papists themselves believe the *Bread* to be turned into the substance of *Christ's Body*, because Christ said *This is my Body*: Either these words refer to the *Bread*, and then by their own Confession they will require our Interpretation; or if they do not, it is evident that then from these words they can have no Grounds to conclude their own pretended change.

So necessarily do both the words themselves and their own Confession, lead us to the Exposition which we make of them. And what these prepare us to receive, the same, 2dly. "*The Intention of our Saviour in this Holy Sacrament, do's yet more strongly confirm to us.*"

Exod. 12.

When God delivered the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, he instituted the Passover to be a continual Remembrance of that great deliverance. In like manner our Blessed Saviour being now about to work out a much greater deliverance for us, by offering up himself upon the Cross for our Redemption, he design'd by this Sacrament

to

to continue the memory of this Blessing, That "*as often*" 1 Cor. 11. 26.  
 "*as we eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, we might*  
 "*shew forth the Lords Death till his Coming.*"

That this Sacrament instituted for the like end which the Passover had been, and now for ever to succeed in its place, might be both the better understood, and the easier received by them, it pleased our Blessed Lord to accommodate himself as near as was possible to the Ceremonies and Phrases they had before been used to. He retain'd the Symbols, and even the Expressions they had so long been acquainted with; only he changed the application of them to a new and more excellent Remembrance.

In the Jewish Passover, the Master of the House took Bread, and brake it, and gave it to them, saying, "*This is the Bread of Affliction, which our Fathers eat in Egypt.*" In this holy Sacrament, our Saviour after the very same manner, took Bread, and brake it, and gave it to them, saying, "*This is my Body which is broken for you; Do this in remembrance of Me.*"

Now as it is evident, that that Bread which the Jews every Year took, and brake, and said, "*This is the Bread of Affliction which our Fathers eat in Egypt,*" was not that very Bread which their Ancestors so many Generations before had eaten there; but was design'd only to be the Type or Figure of it: so neither could our Saviours Disciples to whom he spake, and who, as being Jews, had so long been acquainted with that Phrase, ever believe, That the Bread which he held in his hand, which he brake and gave them, saying, "*This is my Body which is broken for you, Do this in remembrance of me,*" was the very, actual, real Body of Christ which they saw before them at the Table. They understood it, no doubt, to be the Type and Figure of that Body which was now about to be broken for them; as that Bread which the Master of the Feast, after the very same manner, was wont to break to them, was the Type of that Bread of Affliction which their Fathers had eaten in Egypt.

M

Nor



1 Cor. 5. 7.

Nor does the Phrase, *My Body*, at all weaken, but rather confirm this *Idea*, as being the ordinary expression among the *Jews*, whereby they called the Passover, *The Body of the Passover, The body of the Paschal Lamb*. It was therefore used here by our Saviour with that allusion, the more expressly to signify, that he was the *true Passover* now to be sacrificed for us, by whose Blood we were to be delivered from the destroying Angel, and for the Remembrance whereof, we were therefore to keep this Ceremony, as the *Jews* had done their Passover for the other.

This we suppose to be the undoubted Interpretation of this place. Monsieur *de Meaux* ought the less to except against it, in that it was the original remark, not of any *Protestant*, or of any other Party of Christians differing from the Church of *Rome* in this matter, but was objected to them by the very *Jews* themselves long before the *Reformation*, upon the same account. They shew'd by it, that in the Doctrine of this pretended Change, the Church of *Rome* had evidently opposed the design of our Saviours Institution, and advanced an *Interpretation*, which no one accustomed to the *Jewish Notions*, as the Apostles were, could ever have understood to be his meaning.

The design of this discourse permits me not to proceed to any more particular vindication of this Exposition, nor to mention many other Arguments more usually proposed; and wherein it has clearly been shewn, that they have not only the *holy Scripture*, and the *design of our Blessed Saviour* in this Sacrament, but *Sense, Reason, Antiquity*, whatsoever is able to furnish an Argument, all unanimously against them: It remains only to examine whether what Monsieur *de Meaux* has proposed, be any thing more reasonable, that so we may go on to the Consequences established upon this foundation.

Where first we cannot conceive why Monsieur *de Meaux* designing to establish the Exposition of the holy Eucharist upon the Analogy which it has to the *Jewish Sacrifices*, should flie off to the nature of their *Sacrifices in general*, where the

the parallel is neither so clear, nor so uncontroverted, as to produce any necessary consequence from the allusion. It would certainly have been more reasonable to compare it, as we have done, with that particular *Sacrifice* of the *Passover* to which it succeeded, and from which therefore, if any, must be shewed the design of it. But we will clear the whole difficulty in a reflection or two, and prove, that what has been offered to us as a *convincing Argument*, is, upon a nearer view, a *meer fallacy*.

And 1. We desire it may be observed, That the *Peace-Offerings* under the Law were designed as an acknowledgment on the peoples part, for those temporal blessings which it pleased God to bestow upon them. And because after the *sacrifice of Isaac*, God first entred into the *Covenant* with *Abraham*, and promised him his Blessing, and to be his God, Gen. 22. 16, and the God of his Seed after him; it seems to have been Ec. further their intention in all these *Sacrifices*, to call to remembrance that *Offering of Isaac* as the foundation of all those blessings for which these *Sacrifices* were appointed as a testimony of their Gratitude.

2. That tho the *Passover*, like the *Sacrifice of the Cross*, was first offered as a *sin-offering* for the delivery of the first-born in the land of *Egypt*; yet that yearly remembrance of it, which God afterwards establish'd, was always esteem'd a *Peace-offering*; and indeed, the perpetual order of their *Sacrifices* clearly demonstrates that it could be no other.

So that the Parallel therefore, for the explaining the nature of the holy Eucharist, must be this:

1. That as the Jews ate of their *Peace-offerings* in General, to call to mind the *Sacrifice of Isaac*, and give God thanks for those blessings which they received by it, and of that of the *Passover* in particular, in memory of *Gods delivering them out of Egypt*; So the Christians partake of this *blessed Sacrament*, in memory of that deliverance which the *Sacrifice of the Cross of Christ*, whom both *Isaac* and the *Paschal Lamb* slain in *Egypt* typified, has purchased for them.

2. That as the *Peace-offering* which the Jews eat, was not

changed into the *Substance* of that first Sacrifice whereof it was the remembrance, but was eaten as a *figure* or *commemoration* of it; so the Christians in their Sacrament are not to think the *Bread and Wine* which Christ has appointed to be our *Peace-offering*, should be changed into the very *substance* of that *Body* which was offered for us upon the Cross, but to be received only as *Types* of it. For thus was the *Peace-offering* in general, a *Type* of *Isaac*, and the *Passover* in particular, the *Type* of that first *Lamb*, which was slain for their deliverance in the Land of *Egypt*.

When therefore Monsieur de Meaux tells us, that the Jews ate the *proper flesh* of their *Peace-offering*; we answer, that so do we the *proper substance* of ours; we eat the *Bread* which Christ appointed to be the remembrance of that deliverance which he has purchased for us, as the *body of the Lamb* was commanded by God to be the remembrance of theirs.

Monsieur de Meaux adds, That the Jews were forbidden to partake of the *proper flesh* of their *Sin-offering*, and of the *Blood*, because that a *perfect Remission* was not then obtain'd, and that therefore by the *rule of contraries*, we ought now to eat of Ours, because a full satisfaction is now made by Christ.

For Reply to which, it might suffice to say, that this *rule of contraries*, should we follow it according to the Letter, would lead Monsieur de Meaux into so many absurdities, that he would be forced himself to abjure his own Principle. According to this rule, the Apostles could not have eaten the *flesh* of Christ before his Resurrection; the Priests under the Law being commanded not to eat of the *Sin-offering* after the third day, and therefore by the *rule of contraries* they could not partake of it before.

Monsieur de Meaux may please to consider how far he will approve of this Conclusion: In the mean time as to his Objection, we have before said, that the remembrance we make in the holy Eucharist, like that of the *Paschal Feast* among the Jews, shews it to be a *Peace-offering*; and for the rest, if, as Monsieur de Meaux pretends, this *Blood*

was mystically forbid under the Law, to shew that a perfect remission of sins was not then obtain'd; It will follow, that for the contrary reason, Christ appointed *the Cup to be received in this holy Sacrament, to testify that full remission which his blood has purchased for us.* The Church of Rome therefore in refusing the Cup to the people, not only violates the express command of our Blessed Saviour; but according to Monsieur de Meaux's Principles, teaches them by it, that a full remission of sins is not yet obtain'd, even by the precious Blood of Christ himself.

It may by this appear what little advantage Monsieur de Meaux can get to justify their Doctrine of the corporeal Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, from the *Analogue* of the *ancient Sacrifices*, which do clearly and necessarily establish the contrary. For what remains of this discourse we are but little concerned in it.

We Confess this Sacrament to be somewhat more than a *meer Figure*; but we deny that therefore it must be his *very Body*. We acknowledge *the power of God, to do whatever he pleases*: Yet Monsieur de Meaux may please to consider, that *Contradictions*, such as to be and not to be at the same time, are even in their own Schools usually excepted. Monsieur de Meaux supposes, that because Christ did not explain his words in the *figurative Sense*, the Apostles must needs have understood them in the *Literal*. But we have before shew'd, that *the Jews*, who are certainly the best Judges, are of a quite contrary opinion, *viz.* That his Apostles knowing his allusion, could never have understood them otherwise than in a *Figure*. In a word, for his last Remark, "*That the Laws of discourse, which permit, that where there is a just Proportion between the Sign and the thing signified, the one may be put for the other; Yet suffer it not to be so, when a Mosaic set of Bread, for instance, is set to represent the Body of a Man*": We must beg leave to say, that neither is the Proportion so small betwixt *the Bread broken* and *Christ's Body broken*, as Monsieur de Meaux would suggest; Or, that if there were, yet since our Saviours institution has set the one



*Do this in Remembrance of Me.*

to represent to us the other ; we think that designation ought to be of more Authority with us, than all their new Laws of Discourse ; invented purposely only to set the fairer Gloss upon so great and apparent an Error.

## A R T I C L E XVII.

*Do this in Remembrance of Me.*

**T**HE Explication of the preceding Article, having engaged us to a length extraordinary, we will endeavour to recompence it by our shortness in this.

We are entirely agreed, that the Intention of the Son of God was to oblige us by these words to commemorate that death which he underwent for our Salvation. We Confess, that that real Presence which we suppose in the Communion, do's not at all contradict the Nature of this Commemoration. We are persuaded, that as *the Jews* eating of their *Peace-Offering*, which was the remembrance of God's Covenant, and particularly of *the Passover*, the Type of that *Paschal Lamb* that was offered for them in Egypt, called to mind the *Sacrifice of Isaac*, and that great *Deliverance* God had wrought for them, in bringing them up out of the Land of Bondage: So whilst we Eat of those Holy Elements which our Saviour Christ has instituted like the *Peace-Offering* among the *Jews*, to perpetuate the Memory of his death, We call to mind the more lively, that great deliverance which He has wrought for us, and render thanks for it, and by faith and repentance apply to our selves the Merits of it.

Thus whilst we receive these Holy signs which he has instituted for our Memorial, we need no real descent of the Son of God from Heaven ; no new Crucifying of the Lord of Glory to raise in our Souls those just resentments we ought to have of so excellent a Blessing. But as a Child cannot but recollect the kindness and affection of a dear Father, as often as he beholds the Monument where his dead Body lies interred : So we much more, cannot chuse but excite our Love to our blessed Redeemer, as often as we see before our eyes these *Sacred Elements* under which he is veiled. Nor is it necessary for this, that this

*Myſtick*



*Mystick Tomb*, as Monsieur de Meaux phrases it, should any more be changed into the *very real Body* of our Saviour to raise this remembrance, than that natural One into the dead Corps of the Father, to recall the tender Affections of his Child at the sight of it.

In a word; As we will not now move any Argument from the nature of this *remembrance*, to oppose that *substantial change*, which we have before combated on more solid grounds; so we suppose much less ought Monsieur de Meaux from the sole opinion of that more *lively remembrance*, which he imagines the actual eating of the very Flesh of Christ would raise in us, then only to do it in a figure, to conclude him to be substantially there. It is evident, that they who believe this change, and they who believe it not, receive him entirely alike. They see, and taste, and feel the same thing: It is *Faith* alone which works in both, and makes the one believing him *spiritually* present, to remember him with the same love, to honour him with the same reverence, and embrace him with the same hope, as the other, who thinks him *corporally*, but yet after a manner altogether unperceivable, contain'd under the sacred Elements that are presented to him.

## ARTICLE XVIII.

*The Doctrine of the Church of England, concerning this Holy Sacrament.*

**T**He sum of our belief as to the nature of this holy Sacrament is this:

We esteem it designed by Christ to be a perpetual memorial of his suffering for us: "*That so often as we eat of this Bread, and Drink of this Cup, we might shew forth the Lords Death, till his coming.*"

1 Cor. 11. 26.

We believe that in this Communion, we do not only remember, but effectually partake our Blessed Saviour, and all the benefits of his passion; Insomuch that to *such as rightly, and worthily, and with Faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of the blessing, is a partaking of the blood of Christ.*

See our 28. Article.

For the manner of this Participation, "*We believe that the Body*"

See the same Article.

"Body and Blood of Christ, are given, taken, and eaten in this Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and that the means whereby this is done, is Faith.

The same Article.

"We believe that the wicked and such as are void of Faith, tho they may visibly and carnally press with their teeth, as St. Augustin saith, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet are no way partakers of Christ, but rather as St. Paul tells us, eat and drink their own damnation, not discerning the Lords body.

I Cor. II.

The same Article.

In a word, "We believe that Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine into the substance of Christs Body and Blood, can never be proved by Holy Scripture, but is repugnant thereunto; contrary to the intention of our Blessed Saviour, and to the nature of this Holy Sacrament; and has given cause to many great abuses, As in the following Article, we shall have occasion more particularly to shew.

This is our Faith of this holy Eucharist: And in this Faith we are confirmed not only by those unanswerable proofs, which our Writers have given, and some of which we have before touch'd upon; but also from those irreconcilable differences, which this Error has thrown the Writers of the Church of Rome into. In effect we find every party exposing the falseness and impossibility of every ones Hypothesis but his own. Their greatest men confess the uncertainty of their own proofs. "That there is not in Scripture any formal proof of

¶ Lomb. 4. sent. dist. 10.  
\* Scotus 4. dist. 2. q. 11.  
\* Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 3. c. 23. ff. secundo dicit.  
Where he cites many others of the same Opinion

.. In 3. D. Th. q. 75. art. 1.  
¶ See Scotus cited by Bellarm. l. 3. de Euchar. c. 23. ff. Unum tamen.

So also Gabriel cited by Suarez, T. 3. disp. 50. sect. 1.  
So Lombard. l. 4. sent. dist. 34. lit. A.

Transubstantiation: So ¶ Lombard, \* Scotus, and many others, "That there is not any, that without the declaration of the Church would be able to evince it: \* So Cardinal Bellarmine himself confesses. "That had not the Church declared her self for the proper sense of the words, the other might with as good warrant have been received: So says . Cardinal Cajetan. That if the words of Consecration refer to the Bread, which is changed by them, then they must be taken in our sense: So the generality of that Communion confess. In a word, ¶ "That this Doctrine was no matter of Faith till the Council of Lateran, 1200 year after Christ, and that had not that and the Council of Trent since interposed, it would not have been so to this very day.

And

And here who can chuse but admire the Power of Truth? That after so many Outcries against us, for Opposing a Doctrine which they would make the World believe it is as clear as if it were written with a Ray of the Sun; after so many *Anathema's* against us for Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and ten thousand repetitions of their great *Scriptum est*, "*This is my Body*": they should at last be forced to confess, "*That they are not, cannot, nor are ever like to be agreed in the Explication of them. That they contain nothing in them necessary to prove this change. That had not the Church declared its self for the Litteral meaning; the Figurative interpretation might with as good Reason have been received. That for 1200 years this Doctrine was no matter of Faith, and but for the Council of Lateran had not been then. In short, that if the words of Institution refer to the Bread, then are we doubtless in the right; and if they do not, how will they ever prove the change which they pretend is made of the Bread into the Body of Christ by them?*"

Certainly confessions, such as these, ought to awake every Papist careful of his own Salvation, into an unprejudiced Examination at least of these things. To consider what Foundation there really is for this Doctrine, and what desperate Consequences, unknown to Antiquity, contrary to the formal words of Holy Scripture, and without Gods infinite Mercy, absolutely destructive of their eternal Salvation, have been built upon it.

As we hope that these declarations have been permitted by God to fall from the greatest, and most Esteemed of their Church, not only to confirm us in our Faith, but also to prepare the way for their re-

turn to that *Catholick truth*, from which they have so long erred; so we doubt not, by Gods blessing, but that they will in time attain to it, when being sensible of that Tyrannical usurpation that has been made over their Consciences, and resolved to use that Knowledg God has given them, to search the Scriptures, and examine their Faith, and not servily follow every Guide that will but pretend to lead them: They shall seriously and indifferently weigh all these things, and find that therefore only they have thought us in darkness, because their own Eyes were shut that they might not discern the light.

---

## ARTICLE XIX.

### *Of Transubstantiation, and of the Adoration of the Host.*

**W**Hat remains of this Subject of the Holy Eucharist, being wholly consequent upon the foregoing mistaken interpretation of the Words of our Blessed Saviour before considered; we should have passed them over as things we have in effect already declared, that the Church of *England* receives not; but that we are perswaded the particular consideration of them will yet more fully shew the falseness of that Foundation upon which they are built.

Monfieur *de Meaux* in proving the Corporeal presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, from the Words of institution, "*This is my Body*": had something that at least seemed to favour his mistake; but to produce them here for *Transubstantiation*, that is, not only to argue the presence of Christ's substance, but also

also the change of the substance of the *Bread and Wine* into it, he has not the least appearance of the Text for him.

Indeed were there no other way for Christ to be present in the Eucharist, but only by this change; it might then be allowed that having, as he imagines, proved the one, he had in effect established the other. But the number of those who interpret the Words in like manner according to the Letter, yet are as great enemies as our selves to this change; and suppose Christs Body to be present by a *Union of it to the Bread*, rather than by a *Conversion of the Bread into it*; not only shews that there is no necessary consequence at all between the *real presence*, and *Transubstantiation*, but that there is another manner of Christs presence, both more agreeable to Holy Scripture, than that which they advance; and that takes off infinite difficulties which their *Transubstantiation* involves them in.

That the Substance of the Sacred Figures remains in this Sacrament after the *Consecration*, those clear expressions of St. Paul, wherein he so often calls them \* *Bread and Wine* after it, seem to us plainly to shew: † *To break Bread*, the Holy Scripture tells us was the usual Phrase all the time of the Apostles, for receiving the Holy Communion; and which the Blessed Spirit himself dictated. These passages Monsieur de Meaux certainly ought not to put off with a Figurative meaning, unless he can give us some good reason why he follows the *High road* of the Literal interpretation in the one, to establish the Substance of Christs Body in the Sacrament; and forsakes it in the other, to take away the Presence of the Bread from it.

\* 1 Cor. 10.

16. &c.

— 11. 26.

† Acts 2. 46.

&c.



See her Rubric at the end of the Communion Office.

For the *Adoration of the Host*, The Church of England consequently to her Principles of the Bread and Wine's remaining in their natural substances, professes that she thinks it "*to be Idolatry, and to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.*"

Monsieur de Meaux, in Conformity to theirs, tells us, "*That the presence of Christs Body in the Eucharist ought to carry all such as believe it without all scruple to the Adoration of it.*" This therefore being taken as a Principle acknowledged by them; it may not be amiss to observe, that since it is certain, that neither Christ nor his Apostles appointed or practised, nor the Church for above 1000 Years required or taught *any Adoration of this Holy Sacrament*; neither could they, according to Monsieur de Meaux's Principles, have believed the *Corporeal Presence* of our Blessed Saviour in it.

Is there any of the Evangelists that mentions it? They all tell us, *Take, Eat; Do this in remembrance of me.* But does any one add, *This is my Body, fall down and Worship it?*

I Cor. II. 20,  
&c.

When St. Paul reproved the *Corinthians* for violating this Holy Sacrament; is it possible he could have omitted so obvious a Remark, and so much to his purpose; That in profaning this Holy Sacrament, they were not only guilty of the *Body and Blood* of Christ, which it was instituted to represent to us; but even directly affronted their Blessed Master corporally present there; and whom instead of profaning, they ought, as they had been taught, *to Adore in it?*

With what simplicity do the Ancient Fathers speak of this Communion in all their Writings? *The Elevation* of the Sacred Symbols was not heard of till the Seventh

Seventh Century; and then used only to represent the lifting up of Christ upon the Cross, not to expose it to the People to adore it. *The Bell, the Feast of the St. Sacrament, the Pomp of carrying it through the Streets*, all the other Circumstances of this Worship, are inventions of yesterday. The exposing of it upon the Altar to make their Prayers before it; their Addresses to it in times and cases of Necessity; their performing the chiefest acts of Religion in its presence, never mentioned in Antiquity.

Nay, instead of this Worship, they did many things utterly inconsistent with it. They disputed with the Heathens for *worshipping Gods their own Hands had made*. Was it ever objected to them, that they themselves did the same: Worship a Deity whose substance they first formed, and then spoke it into a God? They *burnt in some Churches what remained of the Holy Sacrament*. They *permitted the People to carry it home*, that had Communicated: They *sent it abroad by Sea, by Land*, without any the least regard that we can find had to its *Worship*: They *buried it with their Dead*; they made *Plaisters of the Bread*, they *mix'd the Wine with their Ink*. These certainly were no instances of *Adoration*: Nor can we ever suppose that they who did such things as these, ever believed that it was the very *Body and Blood* of their dear Master, whom they so much loved; and whom doubtless they would have been as ready to have worshipped, had they so believed; as both Monsieur *de Meaux* supposes they ought to have been, and as we see others for the rest no more pious than those Primitive Christians were, now to do it.

## ARTICLE XX.

## Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

A Third Consequence of the *Corporeal Presence* of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, is the *Sacrifice of the Mass*: In which we ought to proceed with all the Caution such a Point requires, as both makes up the chiefest part of the Popish Worship, and is justly esteem'd one of the greatest and most dangerous Errors that offends us.

Monfieur de Meaux has represented it to us with so much tenderness, that except perhaps it be his Foundation of the *Corporeal Presence*, on which he builds, and his Consequence that this Service is a *true and real Propitiatory Sacrifice*, which his manner of expounding it we are perswaded will never bear; there is little in it besides but what we could readily assent to.

We distinguish the two Acts, which he mentions, from one another. By the *Consecration* we apply the *Elements*, before common, to a Sacred use; by the *Munducation*, we fulfil our Saviour's Command; "We *take, and eat, and Do this in remembrance of Him.*"

This *Consecration* being separately made of his *Body broken, his Blood spilt* for our Redemption, we suppose represents to us our Blessed Lord in the figure of his Death, which these holy Symbols were instituted to continue the memory of. And whilst thus with Faith we represent to God the Death of his Son, for the pardon of our sins; we are perswaded,

ded, that we incline his Mercy the more readily to forgive them.

We do not therefore doubt, but that this presenting to God Almighty the *Sacrifice* of our Blessed Lord, is a most effectual manner of applying his *Merits* to us. Were this all the Church of *Rome* meant by her *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, there is not certainly any Protestant that would oppose her in it.

Where is that Christian that does not by *Faith unite himself to his Saviour* in this holy Communion? That does not present him to God as his *only Sacrifice* and *Propitiation*? That does not protest that he has nothing to offer him but *Jesus Christ*, and the *Merits of his Death*? That consecrates not all his prayers by this Divine Offering; and whilst he thus presents to God the Sacrifice of his Son, does not learn thereby to present also himself a lively Sacrifice, holy, and acceptable in his sight?

This is, no doubt, a *Sacrifice* worthy a Christian, infinitely exceeding all the Sacrifices of the Law. Where the Knife is the Word, the *Blood shed not but in a figure, nor is there any Death but in Representation*. A Sacrifice so far from taking us off from that of the Cross, that it unites us the more closely to it; represents it to us, and derives all its Vertue and Efficacy from it.

This is, if any other, truly *The Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, and such as the Church of England has never refused: and except it be our doubt of the *Corporeal Presence*, Monsieur de Meaux had certainly reason to expect, that there was nothing in this we could justly except against.

But now that all this is sufficient to prove the *Mass* to be a "*True and Proper Sacrifice, truly and properly* Concil. Trident.  
"pro. Sess. 22.

“propitiatory for the sins and punishments, the satisfactions and necessities of the dead and the living; and that to offer this true and proper Sacrifice, our Saviour Christ instituted a true and proper Priesthood, when he said, *Do this in Remembrance of Me*: This is what we cannot yet understand, and what we think we ought not ever to allow of.

We know indeed, that the Primitive Church, called the holy *Eucharist* a *Sacrifice*, in that large extent of the Expression, whereby the holy Scripture styles every religious performance, our *Prayers*, our *Thanksgivings*, our *Vertues*, our *very Selves*, *Sacrifices* to God: And accordingly in our own *Liturgy*, we do, without all scruple, do the same. But when it comes to be set in Opposition to a Sacrament, and to be considered in the true and proper signification of the Word; we must, with all Antiquity, needs profess, That we neither have, nor can we after that of Christ admit of any.

Hence it is, that our Church following the Doctrine of the Holy Apostles and Primitive Christians, See Article 31. teaches, “*That the Offering of Christ once made, is that proper Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the sins of the whole World; and that there is no other Satisfaction for sin but that alone.* That the Application of Christs Death by Faith in the Holy Eucharist, is made to all such as with true Repentance receive the same, we undoubtedly believe. We are perswaded, that by our Prayers, which in this holy Solemnity we never fail to offer for the wants and necessities, the pardon and forgiveness not of our selves only, but of all Mankind; of those who have not yet known the Faith of Christ; or that knowing it, have prevaricated from the right way, we incline



cline Gods Mercy to become *propitioms* unto them. Only we deny, that by this holy Eucharist, as by a *true and proper Propitiatory Sacrifice*, we can appease Gods Wrath for the sins of the whole World; can fulfil the satisfactions, and supply the necessities of other men; of the *dead* and the *living*; of them that are absent, and partake not of it. This we attribute to the Sacrifice of the Cross only; and are perswaded that it cannot, without derogation to the Merits of that most absolute Redemption which was there purchased for us, be applied to any other.

When we examine the first *Institution* of this holy Communion, we cannot perceive either in the words or action of our Blessed Saviour, any *Sacrificial Act* or *Expression*. "He took bread, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, Take, Eat, This is my Body which is given for you: Do this in Remembrance of Me."

Monsieur de Meaux seems to imply, that the *Consecration* made it a Sacrifice. But this *Vasquez* tells us, that others think to be only a *preparation to it*, because till after the *Consecration* Christ is not there, and by Consequence cannot be offered. In. 3. D. Th. disp. 222. c. 1.

The Council of Trent seems to refer it to the *Oblation*: This *Bellarmino* opposes, because neither Christ nor his Apostles used any. L. 1. de M. c. 27.

*Bellarmino* is positive, that either Christ sacrificed in Eating, or there is no other action in which he can be said to have done it. Yet even this the greatest part of that Communion reject; because *Eating* is not *Offering*: and in the Ordination where the Priest receives the power of *Sacrificing*, not any mention is made of it. In Effect, Reason will tell us, That this is to partake of the *Offering*, not to offer it; and Monsieur

*sieur de Meaux* himself accordingly distinguishes the Two Acts of *Consecration* and *Manducation* from one another, and refers the Sacrifice wholly to the former.

If we consider the Nature of a *true and proper Sacrifice*, they universally agree, that these Four Things are necessarily required to it: 1. That what is Offered be something that is *Visible*: 2. That of *prophane*, which it was before, it be now made *sacred*: 3. That it be *offered to God*: And 4. by that offering suffer an *essential destruction*.

Now we suppose, that the greatest part of these Conditions are evidently wanting to this pretended Sacrifice of *Christ's Body* in the *Mass*. 1. It is *Invisible*: They confess it. 2. It was never *prophane*, that it should be made *sacred*: They will not presume to say that it was. 3. It suffers no *Essential destruction*: "*The Blood is not spilt but in a Mystery*, says *Mon-sieur de Meaux*, *nor is there any Death but in Representation*.

As therefore none of these things *truly and properly* agree to this holy Eucharist, so we suppose, that neither can it be *truly and properly a Sacrifice*. We are persuaded, that the *Offering* its self, like the *necessary and essential Properties* of it, must be only in *Figure and Representation*. This is what we willingly allow *Monsieur de Meaux*, and what their own Principles do undoubtedly prove.

For what our Saviour adds, "*Do this in Remembrance of Me*: However the Council of *Trent* has Canonically resolved it to be the Institution of a true and proper *Priesthood*, to offer this Sacrifice; yet that it has no such Proof, the preceding Discourse evidently shews. Our Saviour *Christ* commanding his

his Apostles to *Do this*, commanded them to *Do* no more than what himself had done: So that if he therefore did not *Sacrifice* himself, neither did he give any Authority to them, or to their Successors to *Sacrifice*.

# ARTICLE XXI.

## Of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

**T**HE Epistle to the *Hebrews* so clearly establishes our Doctrine, in Opposition to the pretended Sacrifice of *the Mass*, that Monsieur de *Meaux* had certainly reason to enter on a particular consideration of it. We will, after his Example, follow the same Method, and shew the whole Design of that Sacred Book to be directly contrary to the Principles of the *Roman Church*.

Monsieur de *Meaux* observes, that the Author of this Epistle concludes, that there ought not only *no other Victim* to be offered for sin after that of Christ, but that even Christ himself ought not to be any more Offered. Now, the reason which the Apostle gives, is this; Because that otherwise, says he, *Christ must of-ten have suffered*: Plainly implying, that there can be no true Offering without Suffering. So that in the *Mass* then, either Christ must Suffer, which Monsieur de *Meaux* denies, or he is not Offered, which we affirm. Heb. 9. 25, 26.

This is so evidently the meaning of that place, and so often repeated, "*That without Blood, there is* Heb. 9. 22.  
"*no Remission*"; that Monsieur de *Meaux* is forced

freely to declare, that if we take the word *Offer* as it is used in that Epistle, they must profess to the whole World, that Christ is no more *Offered*, either in the Mass, or any other way. Now, how these things can stand together, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* contradicts not the Offering of the Mass, and yet that the same Epistle absolutely declares, that Christ can no more be *Offered*, because he can no more *Suffer*; nor any more become a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, because *without Blood there is no Propitiation*: All which Monsieur de Meaux allows, and professes to the whole World, that in the Notion of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *Christ is not offered* in the Mass, nor can be any where else, we are not very well able to comprehend.

But that Epistle goes yet further. It tells us, that Christ ought to be but once offered, because "by that  
 Heb. 10. 14. "one Offering he has fully satisfied for our sins, and  
 "has perfected for ever them that are Sanctified. If  
 therefore by that first Offering he hath fully satisfied  
 Ibid. v. 18. for our sins, there is then "no more need of any Offer-  
 "ing for sin: If by that first Sacrifice he hath per-  
 "fected for ever them that are Sanctified, the Mass cer-  
 tainly must be altogether needless to make any addi-  
 tion to that which is already perfect. In a word, if  
 the Sacrifices of the Law were therefore repeated, as  
 this Epistle tells us, because they were *imperfect*; and  
 had they been otherwise, they should have ceased to  
 have been offered. What can we conclude, but the  
 Church of *Rome* then, in every Mass she Offers, does  
 violence to the *Cross of Christ*; and in more than  
 one sense, *Crucifies to her self the Lord of Glory*.

Lastly, The Council of *Trent* declares, that be-  
 cause there is a new and proper *Sacrifice* to be offered,  
 it

it was necessary that our Saviour Christ should institute a new and proper *Priesthood* to offer it. And so they say he did, after the *Order of Melchisedeck*, in Hebr. 7. 3. opposition to that after the *order of Aaron* under the Law. Now certainly nothing can be more contrary to this Epistle than such an assertion: Both whose description of this Priesthood shews it can agree only to our Blessed Lord; and which indeed in expresse terms declares it to be peculiar to him. It calls it *an un-* Ibid. v. 27. *changeable Priesthood*, that passes not to any other, as that of *Aaron* did from Father to Son, but continues in him only, because that he also himself continues for evermore.

---

ARTICLE XXII.

Reflections on the foregoing Doctrine.

**A**Nd here then let us conjure our Brethren of the Church of *Rome* seriously to consider these things; and into what desperate consequences that great Errour of the *Corporeal presence* has insensibly led them.

Can any thing be more rash or more uncharitable, even the Literal interpretation of this Holy Eucharist being allow'd, than their *Canon of Transubstantiation*? To cut off from their Communion the greatest and most Orthodox part of the Christian Church, only for a Nicety; a *manner of presence*, which neither has the Scripture any where revealed, and which they themselves never understood.

It.



Is it possible for men to fall into a grosser or more dangerous Error, than to set up a *Waser* for their God, and pay a divine Worship to a *Morsel of Bread*? Shall their good Intentions secure them? Had not the *Israelites* a good Intention to "*hold a feast unto the Lord*, when they Worshipped the Molten Calf? Were they therefore not *Idolaters* for it? Had this been a sufficient excuse, *Nadab* and *Abihu* had not been punished: Their intention was certainly good to *burn Incence to the Lord*. The Jews had a good intention even in *Crucifying the Lord of glory*: *St. Paul* thought it Zeal to persecute his Disciples. Our Blessed Saviour has foretold, and we live to see it accomplished, that the time should come when Men should *kill their Brethren, and think they did God good service*. The Church of Rome may do well to consider whether their good intention will justify them that do it; and whether both in this, and that, they do not run a desperate hazard, if it appear that they have no other plea than a well meant mistake to excuse them.

For our parts we must needs profess that these things give us not only a scandal but a horror for their Religion. *Montieur de Meaux* had certainly reason to say, that this is the *Chiefest* and *most important* of all our controvesies, and wherein we are at the farthest distance from one another. And would to God they had only offended us by these Errours; and had not exposed our common Name to the reproach of the very Heathen; who have been confirmed by them in their *Idolatry*, and thought it more rational to adore a Stock or a Stone, than with the Christians to Worship this moment what they Eat the very next.

But

But Monsieur de Meaux thinks we have no reason to appear so obstinate against them, who declare our selves so favourably towards the *Lutherans*, who yet are involved in the same Error. 'Tis true we believe the *Lutherans* mistaken in their Literal interpretation of this Holy Sacrament. But we are perswaded they are infinitely less so, and less dangerously than the Papists.

They confess that there is no change made in the *Substance of the Sacred Elements*. They believe that the *Bread and Wine* continue in their proper Natures, and that Christs Body is present only when he is received. They adore not the Holy Eucharist: They found no Propitiatory Sacrifices upon it: They say no Masses for the sins and satisfactions, for the wants and necessities of the Dead and the Living: They deny not the Cup to the People; their Errour in one word, whatsoever it be, is only a matter of simple belief; has no ill consequences attending it, nor do they damn us for not receiving it.

Let the Church of *Rome* do all this: Let them raze their *Anathema's* out of their Councils, and banish their Masses and Adorations out of their Churches; Let them no longer scandalize us with any unwarrantable practices, nor desire to enslave our Consciences by submitting them to their own inventions; and though we shall still think *Transubstantiation* to be the greater Error, yet will we receive them with the same charity we do the *Lutherans*: We will pray to God to give them a better understanding, but will not drive them from our Communion, for matters of simple belief, and which are only to themselves, tho' they be wrong.

But

*Reflections on the foregoing Doctrine.*

But till then, in vain do's Monsieur de Meaux exhort us to consider the ways of providence to bring us to a Union, which God knows we could be glad to have on any terms but the loss of truth. In the mean time if the Church of *Rome* in good earnest thinks, that as we tolerate the foundation of all these Errours, *the Corporeal presence* in the *Lutherans*, so we ought to bear the consequences of it in them: Let them at least do what the *Lutherans* have done; let them embrace our Communion; let them leave off to persecute us where they have power, and damn us where they have not; let them receive us as Brethren, not Lord it over us as our Masters. This will make us hope that they are sincere when they conjure us to be at peace with them, and they may justly then accuse us of partiality, if we continue to repute them as Enemies, when they will be thus content to love, and receive, and deal with us as friends.

## ARTICLE. XXIII.

*Of Communicating only under one kind.*

THIS is the last of those consequences that give us a just detestation for that great Errour of *the Corporeal presence* on which they are founded. It is so plainly contrary to the express command of our Blessed Saviour, that we are perswaded it has pleased God to suffer them to fall into it, on purpose to correct that vanity whereby they have so proudly aspired to an Opinion of *Infallibility*: That whilst they Lord it over mens Consciences, and will not so much  
as

Of Communion under One kind.

73

as give them leave to ask them a Reason of what they do, they might here at last be surpris'd in an Error which the most vulgar Eye is able to discern.

The Church of England conformably to all Antiquity declares, "That the Cup ought not to be deny'd to the Lay-people; forasmuch as both parts of the Lords Sacrament by Christs Ordinance and Commandment, ought to be ministred to all Christian men alike." See our 30th Article.

For indeed, Did not he who said of the Bread, "Take, Eat, this is my Body, say also of the Wine, with the same expressness, "Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for you for the remission of sins?"

Did not he who commanded them, "Do this in Remembrance of Me, for the Bread, even according to their own Construction, Take and Consecrate, and give to Others, as I have done to you; command them for the Cup in like manner, "Do this; i. e. consecrate, and give it to Others, as I have done to you, in remembrance of Me?"

We confels, That the Grace of God is not tied to the outward signs: Yet we think withal, that without taking the outward and visible signs, we can have no pretence to the inward and spiritual Grace of that holy Sacrament; which deriving all its Effect from our Saviour's Promise, we can have no security that it shall have any good one to them, who do not receive it according to his Institution.

Had Christ esteemed it sufficient for us to receive the Blood in the body, we suppose he would not have consecrated the Cup afterwards. But if it was our Saviour's pleasure, that to commemorate the more lively his Passion, we should take his Blood as it was spilt for our Redemption, separate from his Body; we think

P

it

*Of Communicating under One kind.*

it an unwarrantable presumption for us to make ourselves wiser than God, and say, that it is sufficient to partipate of Both in One.

Monsieur *de Meaux* has received so full an Answer upon this point, from the Reply made to his Treatise written purposely on this Subject, that he will have no cause to complain of us for not repeating here, what has been so fully and so successfully handled there.

Only as to that Negligence of these latter Ages, which he is pleased to alledge as the reason of this change; We must needs say, that God be thanked, we cannot observe any such Negligence of this holy Communion in our Churches, where yet this holy Sacrament is administred to as large Congregations, and with as great frequency as any where among Them. Both our Priests and the People, give and receive it with that Care and Reverence, that we find as little grounds for any such pretence, as there is reason in it, were it never so true, to justifie so great and unwarrantable a Change.



---

PART III.

OF THE

CHURCH.

---

ARTICLE XXIV.

*Of the Word Written and Unwritten.*

**O**UR Blessed Saviour having founded his Church upon the Word which He preached, we confess, that the unwritten Word, as to that Gospel which he preached, was *the first Rule* of Christians. But God Almighty foreseeing how liable such a Rule must have been to infinite Inconveniencies, thought fit to have that Word which was first spoken by Mouth, afterwards consigned to Writing. By which means the Word written and unwritten were not Two different Rules, but as to all necessary matters of Faith, one and the same: And the unwritten Word so far from *losing its Authority*, that it was indeed the more firmly Establish'd, by being thus delivered to us by the holy Apostles and Evangelists.

We receive with the same Veneration whatsoever comes from the Apostles, whether by Scripture or Tradition, provided that we can be assured that it comes from them. And if it can be made appear, that any Tradition which the Written Word contains not, has been received by *All Churches*, and in *All Ages*, we are ready to embrace it, as coming from the Apostles.

Monsieur de Meaux therefore ought not to charge us as Enemies to Tradition, or obstinate, to receive what is so delivered. Our Church rejects not *Tradition*, but only *those things which they pretend to have received by it*: But which we suppose to be so far from being the Doctrine of the *Apostles*, or of *All Churches* in *All Ages*, that we are perswaded they are many of them directly contrary to the *Written Word*, which is by Themselves confessed to be the Apostles Doctrine, and which the best and purest Ages of the Church adhered to.

## ARTICLE XXV.

### *Of the Churches Authority.*

**T**HE Church; *i. e.* *The Universal Church in All Ages*, having been Establish'd by God, the Guardian of the Holy Scriptures, and of Tradition, we receive from her the *Canonical Books of Scripture*. It is upon this Authority, that we receive principally the *Song of Solomon* as Canonical, and reject other Books as Apochryphal, which we might perhaps with as much readiness otherwise receive. By this Authority

ity we reverence these Books, *even before by our own reading of them, we perceive the Spirit of God in them*: And when by our reading them, we find all things conformable to so Excellent a *Spirit*, we are yet more confirmed in the belief and reverence we before had of them.

This Authority therefore we freely allow the Church, that by her hands in the succession of the several Ages, we have received the Holy Scriptures. And if as *universal and uncontroverted a Tradition* had descended for the *Interpretation* of the Scriptures, as for the receiving of them, we should have been as ready to accept of that too. Such a declaration of the sense of Holy Scripture as had been received by *all Churches*, and in *all Ages*, the Church of England would never refuse: But then as we profess not to receive the Scriptures themselves *only*, or perhaps *principally* upon the *Authority of the Roman Church*, which has in all Ages made up but a *part*, and that not always the *greatest* neither, of this *Tradition*; so neither can we think it reasonable to receive the sense of them only from her, though she profess never so much, to invent nothing of her self, but only to declare the *Divine Revelation* made to her by the *Holy Ghost*, which she supposes has been given to her for her direction: Whilst we are persuaded, that neither has any Promise at all been made to any *particular Church* of such an infallible direction; and have such good cause to believe that this particular Church too often, instead of the divine Revelations, declares only her own Inventions.

When the dispute arose about the *Ceremonies of the Law*, Acts 15. the Apostles assembled at *Jerusalem*, for the determination of it. When any Doubts arise

rise in the Church now, we always esteem it the best Method to decide them after the same manner. That the Church has Authority not only in matters of *Order* and *Discipline*, but even of *Faith* too, we never deny'd : But that therefore any Church so assembled, can with the same Authority say now, as the Apostles did then, "*It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to Us* : This we think not only an unwarrantable presumption, for which there is not any sufficient ground in Holy Scripture, but evidently in its self untrue, seeing that many such Councils are by the Papists themselves confessed to have erred.

Acts 15. 28.

Hence it is that we cannot suppose it reasonable to forbid Men the Examination of the *Churches Decisions*, which may err, when the *Holy Apostles*, nay our *Saviour Christ* himself, not only permitted, but exhorted their Disciples to search the Truth of their Doctrine, which was certainly *Infallible*. Yet if the determination be matter of Order or Government, as *not to Eat of things offered to Idols*, &c. or of plain and undoubted Precept, as "*to abstain from Fornication*, and the like : Here we fail not after the Example of *Paul* and *Silas*, to declare to the faithful what her decision has been ; and instead of permitting them to judg of what has been so resolved, teach them throughout all places "*to keep the Ordinances of the Apostles*.

Acts 16. 4.

Thus is it that we acquiesce in the judgment of the Church ; and professing in our Creed a *Holy Catholick Church*, we profess to believe not only that there was a Church planted by our Saviour at the beginning, that has hitherto been preserved by him, and ever shall be to the end of the World ; but do by consequence undoubtedly believe too, that this *Universal Church* is so secured by the Promises of Christ, that there shall al-

ways

ways be retain'd so much Truth in it, the want of which would argue that there could be no such Church. We do not fear that ever the *Catholick Church* should fall into this *entire Infidelity*: But that any *particular Church*, such as that of *Rome*, may not either by Error lose, or by other means prevaricate the Faith, even in the *necessary Points* of it; this we suppose not to be at all contrary to the Promise of God Almighty, and we wish we had not too great cause to fear, that the Church of *Rome* has in effect done both.

It is not therefore of the *Catholick Church* truly such, that we either fear this *infidelity*, or complain that she hath endeavoured to render her self *Mistress of our Faith*. But for that particular Communion, to which Monsieur de Meaux is pleased to give the Name, tho she professes never so much to submit her self to the *Holy Scripture*, and to follow the *Tradition* of the Fathers in *all Ages*; yet whilst she usurps the absolute Interpretation both of Scripture and Fathers, and forbids us to examine whether she does it rightly or no, we must needs complain that her Protestations are *invalid*, whilst her Actions speak the contrary: For that if this be not to render her self *Mistress of our Faith*, we cannot conceive what is.

In a word, tho we suppose the Scriptures are so clearly written, that it can very hardly happen, that in the *necessary Articles of Faith* any one man should be found opposite to the whole Church in his Opinion: Yet if such a one were *evidently convinced* that his Belief was founded upon the undoubted Authority of Gods Holy Word, so far would it be from any *Horror* to support it, that it is at this day the greatest glory



*The Authority of the Church.*

glory of *S. Athanasius*, that he stood up alone against the whole World in defence of *Christ's Divinity*, when the Pope, the Councils, the whole Church fell away.

Conclude we therefore, that God, who has made us, and knows what is best and most proper for us, as he has subjected us to the Government and Direction of his Church for our Peace and Welfare, so to secure our Faith, he has given us his Holy Word, to be the last resort, the final, infallible Rule, by which both we and the Church its self must be directed: And from this therefore if any one shall endeavour to turn us aside, or preach any other Gospel unto us than what we have therein received, tho he were an *Apostle* from the Grave, or even an *Angel* from Heaven, let him be *Anathema*.

Gal. i. 8, 9.

## ARTICLE XXVI.

*The Opinion of the Church of England, as to the Authority of the Church.*

FOR the two last Articles of Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, I might very well have pass'd them by. The Church of England, whose Doctrine I pretend to explain, is but very little concerned in them. Therefore only in a word, That we allow the Church a just Authority in matters of Faith, both the declaration of our *xxth. Article*, and the subscription we make to the whole 39 shew: Such a deference we allow to her decisions, that we make them our directions what Doctrine we may, or may not

not, publicly maintain and teach in her Communion: In effect, we shew whatever Submission we can to her *Authority*, without violating *that of God*, declared to us in his *Holy Scriptures*.

Whatsoever deference we allow to a *National Church or Council*, the same we think in a much greater degree due to a *General*. And whensoever such a one, which we much desire, shall be freely and lawfully assembled, to determine the Differences of the *Catholick Church*, none shall be more ready both to assist in it, and submit to it.

---

## ARTICLE XXVII.

*Of the Authority of the Holy See, and of Episcopacy.*

FOR the *Pope's Authority*, tho' we suppose no good Consequence can be drawn from that Primacy we are content to allow *St. Peter* among the *Apostles*, for that exorbitant Power which has of late been pretended to: Yet when other Differences shall be agreed, and the true Bounds set to his Pretences, we shall be content to yield him whatsoever "*Authority the Ancient Councils of the Primitive Church have acknowledged, and the Holy Fathers have always taught the faithful to give him.*"

This Monsieur de Meaux ought to be contented with; who himself absolves us from yielding to those pretences, that have indeed very justly rendred this Authority, not only odious, but intolerable to the World.

Q

Let

Let those who are *Enemies to Episcopacy*, and who deny *any due respect* to the *Chair of St. Peter*, answer for themselves. The *Church of England* has both retain'd the one, and will be ready according to what we have before declared, when ever it shall be requisite, to acknowledge the other.

## THE CLOSE.

SUCH is the *Doctrine of the Church of England* in those points which *Monfieur de Meaux* has thought fit to propose, as the principal matters in debate betwixt us. May it please the unprejudiced *Papist* to say, what he can find in All these, to warrant that bitter and unchristian hatred they have conceived against us. To cut us off, as much as in them lies, from the *Communion of Christs Church on Earth*, and to deny us all part of his promises in *Heaven*.

We firmly believe *the Holy Scriptures*, and whatsoever they teach or command, we receive and submit to, as to the *Word of God*. We embrace all the *ancient Creeds*, and in them all that Faith which the *Primitive Christians* supposed, and which the *Religious Emperors*, by their Advice, decreed should be sufficient to intitle us to the common name of *Catholicks*.

What new *Donatists*, Gentlemen, are you, to presume to exclude us from this Character? And may we not justly demand of you, what *S. Augustin* once did of them on the same occasion; "You say that *Christ* is *Heir of no Lands*, but where *Donatus* is *Co-heir*.  
 "Read this to us out of the *Law and the Prophets*, out of the *Psalms*, out of the *Gospel*, out of the *Sacred Epistles*: Read it to me, and we will believe.

De unitate Ec-  
 lesiæ, c. 6.

We

We accept the *Tradition of Primitive Antiquity* truly such, with a Veneration we dare confidently say greater than your selves. We have shew'd, that the very grounds of our difference is, that you require us to believe and practise such things as the Holy Scripture forbids us, and the Primitive Church never knew.

You command us *to worship Images*: Is it not evident See Article 4. that both the Law and the Gospel have forbid it? and is it not confess'd, that both the Apostles and their Successors abhorred the very name?

You command us *to communicate only under one kind*: That is in our Opinion, nay, it is in yours too, to contradict the *Institution* of our Blessed Saviour, and the practice of the very *Roman* Church for above a Thousand years, and of all other Christians to this very day.

You command us *to pray to Saints and Angels*: Does Article 3. Col. 2. v. 18. Rev. 19. 10. 22. 9. not St. Paul forbid it? Did not the *holy Angel* twice refuse it from St. John? And many Centuries pass without One probable Instance of any that did it?

You command us under pain of your *Anathema* to *believe Transubstantiation*? Do you your selves understand what you mean by it? Is it any where written? Was it ever mention'd for above a Thousand years?

You bid us *Adore the Holy Sacrament*: Has Christ Article 19. prescribed it? Have his holy Apostles written it? Did not here also above a Thousand years pass before any one attempted it?

You require us to believe the blessed Eucharist *to be a true and real Propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins and satisfactions both of the Dead and of the Living*. Article 20. Have ye any probable proof of it? Are ye yet, or ever like to be agreed among your selves about it? Do not your own principles evidently shew the contrary?

Men and Brethren : Consider, we conjure you, these things : And if you please, consider us too, what we are, and what our Manners and Conversation among you has been : Believe us, at least, that we have no other End but Truth in these Enquiries : No other Interest but to save our souls, and go the surest and directest way to Heaven.

The Proofs we offer, they are not vain Conjectures; they are clear, we think, convincing Arguments. And though the design of this little Treatise has been rather to shew you what our Doctrine is, than to give a just account of those Reasons that detain us in it : Yet perhaps even in this there may be somewhat to shew, that we do not altogether build in the Air ; but deserve certainly to have our *Articles* and our *Canons*, both better understood, and better answer'd, if it may be, than they have ever hitherto been.

For to resume yet once more some few of our differences.

Article 3.

You think you ought to *invoke the Blessed Virgin and the Holy Saints*. Now not to repeat what we have before said of the *Unlawfulness* of it, This we suppose to be first *needleless*, because we know we have a more excellent and powerful Mediator, that has commanded us to come to him ; and next *Uncertain*, because you are not able to tell us how, nay, not to secure us that by whatever way it be, our Prayers do always and certainly come up to them. If we are mistaken, at least we run no hazard in it : We address our selves continually to the Throne of Grace, where we are secure that we shall be both heard and answer'd. But now should you err, consider we beseech you how many Prayers you every day lose, and what a dishonour you put upon your divine Mediator. And if you please, consider too how unjust



unjust you are to damn us for not joyning with you in a practice, that has *so great danger, so little assurance, and not any advantage.*

You suppose we ought *to fall down before your Im-* Article 4.  
*ger.* Not to do this is to be sure no sin, you dare not say it is. To do it may be, and you can never secure us it is not abominable *Idolatry*, odious to God, and contrary to that holy Faith into which we have been Baptized.

You damn us for *doubting of the number of your se-* Article 10.  
*ven Sacraments.* Has God revealed it to you? Have the Holy Scriptures defined it? Or even Tradition its self delivered it to you. If it be true; Can you yet escape the charge of rashness and uncharitableness, to damn whole Churches for so needless a matter? Should it be false, how will you escape that *Anathema* your selves; you have then so falsely as well as uncharitably denounced against us?

You require us to believe *that children dying unbap-* Article 10.  
*tized, are excluded the Grace of Christ for ever.* To what purpose this? For what benefit? Were it as evident as it is indeed uncertain, and we are persuaded false; our modesty is safe in *deciding nothing*; the Error of such among us as believe it not is charitable; founded upon the sure Mercies and Goodness of God, who never inflicts any punishment where there is no fault; and in a word, has not any the least ill consequence upon it. We take as great care to Baptize our Infants, as you can do who most believe it. But now if your Opinion should be false; What answer will you ever be able to make to God, for *peremptorily defining* what was *so uncertain and uncharitable*? and for damning us, only because we dare not venture to cut off those from Christ for whom he died, and whom we hope he will in mercy receive to him?

Lastly,

Article 23.

Lastly, You deny us *the entire Communion*; you pronounce an *Anathema* against us, because we will not confess that one part alone is sufficient. Is it not certain that if we err, we have yet both Christs Institution, and the practice and Opinion of many Ages to absolve us? But have you any thing to excuse you, if you are mistaken? To take it as we do, you confess can have no danger, are you sure that to deny it as you do, may not be a Sacrilege?

And what shall I say more? For the time would fail me to speak of every one of those *other points* Monsieur *de Meaux* mentions, much more to add *many others*, and of no less consequence, which he has thought fit to pass by. In all which we have at least this undeniable advantage over you; that besides the clearest Arguments that we are in the right, the hazard we run is not very great if we should not be: Whereas for you, neither is there any tolerable proof of the contrary Errours, and an infinite danger should you chance to be mistaken.

These things, as both the Character of the Book we have now examined, and the Style of many other your latter most considerable Authors, give us cause to hope, begin to be no longer totally hid from your Eyes; so shall we never cease in all our Prayers to make mention of you, that you may be perfectly enlightened to discern, and impartially disposed, to receive and to embrace the Truth.

In the mean time, whilst both you and we mutually address our selves to the *Eternal Truth* for his assistance; whilst as we ought, we implore his mercy, that he would give us a right understanding in all things; remembering this that we are all but Men, and that it is not therefore impossible for either of us to err: That it may be strength of Passion, or prejudice of Education,

nion, or even vehemency of affection, more than the light of Reason, has hitherto kept us in a too fond partiality for our own Opinions: Let us at least, we beseech you, agree in that mutual Charity which alone can secure us amidst all our Errours; which will both best dispose Gods mercy to shew us what is right, and will best incline our Minds to that sincerity which we all pretend to, and I hope all really have to embrace it.

If we cannot yet agree in all the points of our Religion; let us consider, that neither are the dearest friends entirely of the same opinion in every thing. Let us wait Gods pleasure; if it be his will to "*reveal even this also unto us: Nevertheless wherunto we have at-* Philip. 3. 15. "*ready attain'd, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind* 16. *the same thing.*

We believe in the same God; we rely on the same Redeemer; we embrace the same Creeds; we attend the same hopes of an Everlasting Salvation: And in all these, amidst all our other Differences, have at least an entire agreement in what is *most necessary*, and shall we hope to the Honest and sincere among us, *be sufficient for our Eternal Security.*

Let these things engage us to have the same love too: to be more sparing in our *Anathema's*, and more zealous in our *Prayers* for one another, to seek and to maintain the Truth, but to do it so as not to violate our Charity. In a word, whether we write, or speak, to do both as Men who in a little time expect to be brought before a divine Tribunal, where we must render a severe account for all these things; and one Word spoken with this excellent spirit, to close those Divisions that so long have separated us, shall be preferred to ten thousand Volumes of endless and uncharitable controversies, that serve only to widen our breaches, and heighten our Animosities.

F I N I S.

ADVERTISEMENTS  
Of Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell

THE APOLOGY of the Church of England; And an Epistle to the  
Signior Scipio, a Venetian Gentleman, concerning the Council of  
Trent. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God,  
JOHN JEWEL Lord Bishop of *Saubury*. Made English by a Per son  
of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the said Bishop; Collec-  
ed and Written by the same Hand. 8<sup>o</sup>.

The LETTER writ by the last Assembly General of the Clergy of France  
to the *Protestants*, insiring them to return to their Communion. To-  
gether with the *Methods* proposed by them for their Conviction. Transla-  
ted into English, and Examined by GILBERT BURNET, D. D. 1<sup>o</sup>.

The Life of WILLIAM BEDEL D.D. Bishop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. To-  
gether with Certain Letters which passed betwixt him and *James Haddel*, a  
worthie late Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition in *Seville*, in matter of Re-  
ligion, concerning the General Motives to the Roman Obedience. 8<sup>o</sup>.

The Decree made at Rome the second of *March* 1597. condemning some  
Opinions of the *Protestants* and other *Catholics*.

A Discourse concerning the necessity of Reformation, with respect to  
the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*.

A Discourse concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Un-  
known Tongue.

A RAPIST misrepresented by PROTESTANTS. Being a Reply  
to the late Discourse of the same name, by [A Rapist misrepresented and re-  
presented] 1641.

WILLIAM BEDEL D.D. Bishop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. To-  
gether with Certain Letters which passed betwixt him and *James Haddel*, a  
worthie late Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition in *Seville*, in matter of Re-  
ligion, concerning the General Motives to the Roman Obedience. 8<sup>o</sup>.